

DEC 26 1922

Volume XXXVIII

JANUARY, 1923

Number 1

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GOEUBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

KAUFMAN, PAUL.—John Foster's Pioneer Interpretation of the Romantic,	1
KLUGE, F.—Alte und neue Wortgeschichten, - - - - -	14
BAKER, H. T.—A Shakespearean Measure of Morality, - - - - -	18
SNYDER, ALICE D.—A Note on Coleridge's Shakespeare Criticism, - - - - -	23
BUSH, DOUGLAS.—'Runaways' Eyes' Again, - - - - -	32

Reviews:—

PIERRE DE NOLHAC, Ronsard et l'humanisme. [J. L. Gerig.] - - - - -	34
EMIL LUDWIG, Goethe, Geschichte eines Menschen. [O. Manthey-Zorn.]	43
GEORGE SAINTSBURY, Minor Poets of the Caroline Period. Vol. III;	
H. J. C. GRIERSON, Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century. [Ben C. Clough.] - - - - -	46

Correspondence:—

GUIET, RENÉ, An English Imitator of Favart: Isaac Bickerstaffe, - - - - -	54
BROOKS, NEIL C., Scogan's <i>Quem Quæritis</i> and Till Eulenspiegel, - - - - -	57
KLUGE, F., Engl. <i>bless</i> = Lat. <i>benedicere</i> , - - - - -	58
VAN ROOSBROECK, G. L., "Under the Sonne he loketh," - - - - -	59
PATCH, H. R., "Under the Sonne," - - - - -	60

Brief Mention:—

H. CLEMENT NOTCUTT, The Story of Glaucus in Keats's <i>Endymion</i> ,	60
---	----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with inter-
mission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$5.25
and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

TWO NEW VOLUMES IN THE OXFORD SPANISH AND ITALIAN SERIES

Spanish Literature

A PRIMER

By JAMES FITZMAURICE-KELLY

A splendid introduction to Spanish literature which though brief and compact is based on a wide critical and historical knowledge and thoroughly covers the subject from its beginnings in the twelfth century down to 1921. As the author puts it, the readers may find here "a fair answer to any fair question on the intellectual life of Spain."

Serra, *Esame di Coscienza de un Letterato*

Edited with introduction and notes

By PIERO REBORA

Renato Serra's short and uneventful life was ennobled by a heroic end; like Rupert Brooke and Charles Peguy he met his death during the Great War; but the glamour of his end is in no wise responsible for the attention which continues to be given to his works. The *Esame di coscienza* is a searching analysis of a psychological crisis that many a thinking man has undergone during the war, but perhaps an analysis that only a Latin could carry out. It is a typical Italian achievement. The purely formal qualities of the work are too apparent to need elucidation. Serra's choice of words and purity of style are faultless. Few among his contemporaries equal, fewer still surpass the vigor and freshness of his prose. He is eloquent and brilliant without bombast; precise and appropriate in the choice of his words without pedantic affectation or tiresome Tuscanism.

Copies of the above for examination with a view to class use may be had on request



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

American Branch

35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK



MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVIII

JANUARY, 1923

NUMBER 1

JOHN FOSTER'S PIONEER INTERPRETATION OF THE ROMANTIC

Out of the multiplication of studies and conflicting theories which have gathered around the English Romantic Movement during the past thirty years one result stands unchallenged as a self-evident fact: the writers of that period did not know that they were "romanticists." Unlike the self-conscious *Romantiker* and *romantiques* of the Continent, they did not recognize the significance of the widespread change in the European mind, of which they were the prophets; in contrast with the earlier concerted enthusiasm of the Germans and the later sophisticated insurgence of the French, the English never attached any formal significance to the term romantic. These are facts, not opinions; the literature of the time is common property, the evidence, apparently, is all in.

At the same time, the historic interest of the scattered but steadily increasing use of "romantic" by English writers through the Romantic Period is by no means inconsiderable. We need, in fact, as emphasized anew by Professor Lovejoy's recent searching re-examination of the meaning of romantic in early German romanticism,¹ a thorough study of the term, let us say, from 1750 to 1850. The present lack of such special investigation, however, cannot explain the surprising and well-nigh complete neglect of John Foster's essay, "On the Application of the Epithet Ro-

¹"On the Meaning of 'Romantic' in Early German Romanticism," A. O. Lovejoy, *MLN*, 1916 (xxxI), 385-396; 1917 (xxxII), 65-77. See also "Schiller and the Genesis of Romanticism" by the same writer, *MLN*, 1920 (xxxv), 1-10.

mantic," published in 1805. Here is a discussion of some eighteen thousand words, from the pen of an essayist widely known in his own lifetime (1770-1843), appearing in a volume² which ran through at least thirty-five English and American editions. It is not only the pioneer attempt in England to find the meaning and larger implications of the romantic,³ but it anticipates much that is fundamental in all subsequent discussion of the baffling term and of the perennial spiritual phenomena which it describes.⁴ And it achieves at least some constructive interpretation of these phenomena. A work of such significance deserves rescue from oblivion. Such a rescue is the aim of the present study.

By the rigorous method which would honor more recent investigation in semasiology, Foster begins with an exposure of the careless application of censorious terms in general, illustrating with Puritan, Methodist, and Jacobin; and proceeds to a scrutiny of the common disparaging use of romantic.

"For having partly quitted the rank of plain epithets, it has become a convenient exploding word, of more special deriding

² *Essays in a Series of Letters to a Friend*, [his future wife] on the following subjects: *On a Man's Writing Memoirs of Himself; On Decision of Character; On the Application of the Epithet Romantic. Some of the Causes by which Evangelical Religion has been Rendered less Acceptable to Persons of Cultivated Taste*, by John Foster, 1805. Citations are made from vol. 1 of the 3rd ed. in 2 vols. 1806.

³ Probably the first well-known English discussion of the distinction between classical and romantic, one which deserves more frequent recognition, is in Hazlitt's review of Schlegel's "Lectures on Dramatic Literature," *Edinburgh Review*, Feb. 1816, which he quotes at length in "Lectures on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth," Lecture VIII, "On the Spirit of Ancient and Modern Literature," 2nd ed. 1821, p. 321 ff.

⁴ The importance of Foster as a pioneer was suggested in my paper read by title at the MLA. meeting of 1917. *PMLA*. 1918, p. xxviii. Apparently neither Professor Pierce in *Currents and Eddies of the English Romantic Movement*, 1918 (p. 288), nor Professor Babbitt in *Rousseau and Romanticism*, 1920 (p. 8), agrees with my estimate, although obviously the plan of both these studies would permit only brief reference to Foster.

The Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit. (xii, 311, 316, bibl. 512) makes no special mention of the essay.

C. H. Herford, *The Age of Wordsworth*, 12th ed. 1919, merely lists the title, p. 29 n.

Oliver Elton, *A Survey of English Literature*, 1780-1830, ignores him.

This is representative of the treatment accorded Foster by the authorities on this period.

significance than the other words of its order, such as wild, extravagant, visionary. It is a standard expression of contemptuous despatch . . . by the indolent and inanimate on what they deemed impracticable, by the apes of prudence on what they accounted foolishly adventurous, and by the slaves of custom on what startled them as singular."⁵

Thus at the outset he characterizes definitely the significant eighteenth century attitude toward the term with greater precision than in any other statement that I have discovered up to 1805.

"Pray now what do you mean by romantic?" he continues,

"Perhaps one may mean, that the ideas which I am expressing associate in your mind with the fantastic images of Romance; and that you cannot help thinking of the enchanted castles, encounters with giants, solemn exorcisms, fortunate surprises, knights and wizards, dragons and griffins."⁶

The author might well have been thinking of the recent crop of Gothic romances in his own time, but he was actually describing the original examples of the middle ages, as he definitely shows further on. In any case he derives from them what appears to him the determining characteristic of the romantic, that is, "the ascendancy of imagination over judgment."⁷

This is his fundamental definition which forms the basis for the rest of his discussion. From a brief though interesting consideration of the "prevalence of imagination over reason" in the creative attitude of the medieval romancers he passes to the characterization of the

"craving of the human mind for something more vivid, more elated, and more wonderful, than the plain realities of life; as a kind of mental balloon, for mounting into the air from the ground of ordinate experience, as an extra-rational kind of luxury."⁸

With this background he proposes to

⁵ Foster, 1806 ed., p. 240.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 242.

⁷ This phrasing is from an American ed. from the 7th London ed. revised, Andover, 1826, p. 114.

⁸ Ed. of 1806, p. 243.

"look for some of the practical exemplifications of this unfortunate disproportion between the two faculties."⁹

Very plainly it is these "practical exemplifications" which are vital to every student of Romanticism whether they manifest themselves in the first quarter of the nineteenth century or in our own time.

The description of the first of these is so strikingly prophetic of the developments of romanticism that it must be quoted at length:

"Imagination may be indulged till it usurp an entire ascendancy over the mind, and then every subject presented to that mind will excite imagination, instead of understanding, to work; imagination will throw its colours where the intellectual faculty ought to draw its lines; imagination will accumulate metaphors where reason ought to deduce arguments; images will take the place of thoughts, and scenes of disquisitions. The whole mind may become at length something like a hemisphere of cloud-scenery, filled with an evermoving train of changing melting forms, of every colour, mingled with rainbows, meteors, and an occasional gleam of pure sunlight, all vanishing away, the mental like this natural imagery, when its hour is up, without leaving anything behind but the wish to recover vision. And yet, the while, this series of visions may be mistaken for operations of thought, and each cloudy image be admitted in the place of a proposition or a reason; or it may even be mistaken for something sublimer than thinking. The influence of this habit of dwelling on the beautiful fallacious forms of imagination, will accompany the mind into the most serious speculations, or rather musings, on the real world, and what is to be done in it, and expected; as the image, which the eye acquires from looking at any dazzling object, still appears before it wherever it turns."¹⁰

This is nothing more or less than a revelation of what we have come to term "romantic revery,"¹¹ and is a remarkable anticipation of Shelley the poet or Shelley the prose rhapsodist. Such an "extrarational kind of luxury," Foster hastens to explain, is not to be cultivated, "except perhaps in early life," but he considers it wholly human, that the exercise of the imagination "so easy

⁹ 1826 ed., p. 115.

¹⁰ 1806 ed., pp. 248-9.

¹¹ This escape of the mind is described by the term "reveries," on p. 275.

and bewitching, and the scope so infinite, should obtain a predominance over judgment." Foster, in fact, essays here as elsewhere in his discussion to determine the extent to which the mind may profitably disport itself in "the land of chimeras."

In Letter II, continuing the examination of the "romantic modes in which the ascendancy of imagination operates," the author strikes unwittingly but profoundly into one of the central aspects of the extreme romantic attitude, the obsession of uniqueness, a "persuasion in a person's own mind that he is born to some peculiar and extraordinary destiny."¹² This obsession Foster distinguishes carefully from justified confidence in one's ability or destiny, pointing out that the victim of the "visionary presumption . . . takes no deliberate account of what is inevitable in the lot of humanity."¹³ "If this excessive imagination is combined with tendencies to affection, it makes a person *sentimentally* romantic."¹⁴ Foster continues in this significant union of terms, thus forecasting subsequent exploration of the relationships between sentimentalism and romanticism. He then proceeds to sketch with almost uncanny accuracy a distinct type that was shortly to burst upon the world.

"If a passion for variety and novelty accompanies this extravagant imagination, it will exclude from its bold sketches of future life every thing like confined regularity, and common plodding occupations. It will suggest that *I* was born for an adventurer, whose story will one day amaze the world. Perhaps I am to be an universal traveller; and there is not on the globe a grand city, or ruin, or volcano, or cataract, but I must see it. Debility of constitution, deficiency of means, innumerable perils, unknown language, oppressive toils, and the shortness of life, are very possibly all left out of the account.

If there is in the disposition a love of what is called glory, and an almost religious admiration of those capacious and intrepid spirits, one of which has often decided in one perilous day the destiny of armies and of empires, a predominant imagination may

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 255. For an illuminating and profound study of this aspect of romanticism cf. Babbitt's chap. on Romantic Genius in *Rousseau and Romanticism*, which will shortly be supplemented by a historical survey of the idea of original genius by the present writer.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 256-7.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 257. This is the first linking of these terms that I have found.

be left to revel amidst the splendours of military exploit, and to flatter the man that he too is to be a hero, a great general."¹⁵

Thus clearly does Foster add the anticipatory portrait of Byron to that of Shelley.

Apparently, also, Foster divined on a not far distant horizon the signs of eccentricity of manner which was to break out shortly in England and France and which was to continue sporadically in certain aesthetic groups throughout the century, for he cites

"great aversion to the common modes of action and languages, and an habitual affectation of something extraordinary."¹⁶

and describes how

"They will perhaps disdain regular hours, usual dresses, and common forms of transacting business; this you are to regard as the impulse of a spirit whose high vocation requires it to renounce all signs of relation to vulgar minds."¹⁷

It would seem, moreover, that not a single important element of romanticism escapes this critic, for he is prompt to recognize the aspect of romantic solitude, the full significance of which is often overlooked.¹⁸ Thus, speaking of himself, he says,

"the very word *hermit* was enough to transport him, like the witch's broomstick, to the solemn groves, mossy rocks, crystal streams, and gardens of radishes. While this fancy lasted, he forgot the most obvious of all facts, that man is not made for habitual solitude, nor can endure it without misery, except when transformed into a superstitious ascetic."¹⁹

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 258-9, cf. Hazlitt's definitive description of the romantic rebels at the end of the *Lecture on the Living Poets*, in *Lectures on the English Poets*, 1818.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 261.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 261. This does not refer to the future particularly, as the paragraph opens, "you will generally observe," etc. Such a reference suggests the interesting inquiry as the vagaries already noticeable in romantics up to 1805. Cf. Babbitt, *op. cit.*, chap. on Romantic Genius, pp. 58-63 and references there given which will readily suggest other well known aberrations in manners.

¹⁸ It is to be hoped that an important Harvard dissertation on this subject by Professor Odell Shepard of Trinity College may be soon made accessible to students.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 264. The 1826 ed. adds, "nor probably even then." (p. 122).

In this connection Foster begins to lay down the basis of the fundamental fallacy of the romantic attitude in terms amazingly similar to those of the present day humanists. With unusual force and clarity he shows that the illusory character of these various ravings and obsessions is not in their being "uncongenial with the human mind," but in their being "incongruous with the nature of man."

"Perhaps however you will say, What is that nature? Is it not a mere passive thing, variable almost to infinity, according to climate, to institutions, and to the different ages of time?"²⁰

The reply is incisive and significant:

"I speak of human nature in its most general principles only, as social, self-interested, inclined to the wrong, slow to improve, passing through several states of capacity and feeling in the successive periods of life, and the few other such permanent distinctions. Any of these distinctions may vanish from the sight of a visionary mind, while forming, for itself or for others, such schemes as could have sprung only from an imagination become wayward through its excess of power."²¹

This sober, general view of human nature Foster proceeds to apply in a single paragraph of notable conciseness and completeness to the recent attempts to revolutionize society.

"The same charge of being unadapted to man, seems applicable to the speculations of those philosophers and philanthropists who have eloquently displayed the happiness, and asserted the practicability, of an equality of property and modes of life throughout society. Those who really anticipated or projected the practical trial of the system, must have forgotten on what planet those apartments were built, or those harbours were growing, in which they were contemplating such visions. For in these visions they beheld the ambition of another, the avarice of another, the stupidity or indolence of another, and the selfishness of almost all, as mere adventitious faults, superinduced on the character of the species, and instantly flying off at the approach of better institutions, which shall prove, to the confusion of all the calumniators of human nature, that nothing is so congenial to it as industry, moderation, and disinterestedness. It is at the same time but just to acknowledge, that many of them have admitted the necessity of such a grand transformation as to make man another being,

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 262.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 263.

previously to the adoption of the system. This is all very well; when the proper race of *men* shall come from Utopia, the system of polity may very properly come along with them; or these sketches of it, prepared for them by us, may be carefully preserved here, in volumes more precious than those of the Sibyls, against their arrival. Till then, the sober observers of the human character will read these beautiful theories as romances, adapted to excite sarcastic ridicule in their splenetic hours, when they are disgusted with human nature, and to produce deep melancholy in their benevolent ones, when they pity it."²²

My justification for such a lengthy quotation lies in Foster's definite description of political and social Utopianism as a fundamental manifestation of the romantic temper and the romantic view of life. That his obduracy toward the naïve and enthusiastic faith in both the essential goodness and perfectibility of human nature are original in his own time I am not, of course, contending for a moment: he shares the sober and "tough-minded" attitude of such men as Burke and the abler conservatives of the period. But I have not found so unerring analysis of the nature of the imperfect organization of society as conditioned by the constitutional imperfection of the members of that society. In this passage with special clearness we can hear the accents of the contemporary humanistic critics of romanticism.

Turning to the institution of chivalry for further illustration of a similar perversion of normal human expression, Foster presents a diverting picture of the medieval inversions and suppressions of natural desires, concluding this section with the repetition of his general definition that

"schemes and speculations respecting the interests either of an individual or of society, which are inconsistent with the natural constitution of man, may, except where it should be reasonable to expect some supernatural intervention, be denominated romantic."²³

The last paragraph of Letter II passes by awkward transition to a general emotional element in the romantic temper, the *flair*

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 266-7.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 270. Such a statement would, of course, accomplish little except to open the dispute regarding the "natural constitution of man," if Foster had not been careful to define this constitution, quoted above.

for the huge and vast. "All the images in the intellectual scene" of those "subject to this disease," says Foster,

"must be colossal and mountainous. They are constantly seeking what is animated into heroics, what is expanded into immensity, what is elevated above the stars. But for great empires, great battles, great enterprises, great convulsions, great geniuses, great temples, great rivers, there would be nothing worth naming in this part of the creation. All that belongs to connexion, gradation, harmony, regularity, and utility, is thrown out of sight behind these forms of vastness. The influence of this exclusive taste will reach into the system of projects and expectations. The man will wish to summon the world to throw aside its tame accustomed pursuits, and adopt at once more magnificent views and objects, and will be indignant at mankind that they cannot or will not be sublime."²⁴

Thus does Foster anticipate in a first definite survey another important aspect of romanticism. Such unwitting forecast seems today hardly less than uncanny. We feel that Foster's essay should be dated nearer to 1905 than a century earlier.

But our historian before the event, as it were, has by no means finished his survey. In Letter III he explodes the myth of the noble savage and pricks the bubble of primitivism. His emphasis is, indeed, rather on the deluded enthusiast's vision

"transforming a multitude of stupid and ferocious tribes into a community of mild intelligence and regular industry."²⁵

Such a humanitarian dreamer

"would become sober enough, if compelled to travel a thousand miles through the desert, or over the snow, with some of these subjects of his lectures and legislation; to accompany them in a hunting expedition, to choose in a stormy night between exposure in the open air and the smoke and grossness of their cabins; to observe the intellectual faculty narrowed almost to a point, limited to a scanty number of the meanest class of ideas; to find by repeated experiments that *his* kind of ideas could neither reach their understanding nor excite their curiosity; to see the ravenous appetite of wolves exceeded for a season by a stupidity insensible even to the few interests which kindle the utmost ardour of a savage; to witness loathsome habits occasionally diversified by abominable cere-

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 271-2.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 285.

monies; or to be for once the spectator of some of the circumstances which accompany the wars of savages."²⁶

No wonder that the "attempt of some ingenious men to represent the state of wandering savages as preferable to every other condition of life" are "whimsical"!²⁷ In the light of this ironical exposure it is instructive to recall that Chateaubriand's *René* appeared in the same year as these words.²⁸ But it was Foster's voice and not Chateaubriand's that was crying in the wilderness!

This primitivistic fallacy which had been gaining ground steadily for fifty years and which was coloring romantic thought more and more deeply Foster holds up as one of the dangerous delusions of another rapidly developing aspect of romanticism, the enthusiasm for humanitarian reform. This propensity for "projects of a benevolent order,"²⁹ as Foster terms it, one of the marks of the "romantic mind,"³⁰ is marked fatal insistence on "violation of all the relations between ends and means."³¹ We can well understand the chill of disillusion which in these years called forth Foster's pitying scorn for the gushing sympathies and rosy hopes of the 1790's; we can only marvel at the clear sighted condemnation of his phrase "romantic delusion"³² so far in advance of its current application some decades later.

The last two Letters, IV and V, amplify his unsparing exposure of the hollowness of all humanitarian reform which is based on ingenuous beliefs in the sweet reasonableness and docility of human nature. Here Foster appears plainly to be answering the fundamental social philosophy of Godwin.³³ Unfortunately, he says, there is no

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 287-8.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 283.

²⁸ *Atala* had appeared in 1801. Wordsworth's decisive attack on the idealization of the savage in *The Excursion*, III, 950 ff. will be recalled.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 283.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 280.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 273.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 301. And this would apply to the *fin de siècle* pessimism in France. We must wait for at least another generation before such an idea finds expression in England.

³³ Students of Godwin will recognize Foster's use of the phrase "the Omnipotence of Truth."

"avoiding the ungracious perception, in viewing the general character of the race, that, after some allowance for what is called natural affection, and for compassionate sympathy, (an excellent principle, but extremely limited, and often capricious in its operation,) the main strength of human feelings consists in the love of sensual gratification, of distinction, of power and of money."³⁴

Appeals to reason and the innate goodness of the human heart have never availed to regenerate man or bring the millenium.

"Nor do I perceive any signs as yet that we are commencing a better era, in which the means that have failed before, or the expeditions of a new and more fortunate invention, shall become irresistible, like the sword of Michael, in our hands. The nature of man still 'casts ominous conjecture on the whole success.' While *that* is corrupt, it will pervert even the very schemes and operations by which the world should be improved, though their first principles were pure as heaven; and revolutions, great discoveries, augmented sciences, and new forms of polity, will become in *effect* what may be denominated the sublime mechanics of depravity."³⁵

Society, therefore, cannot be regenerated by changing external forms and institutions, for the only meaning of forms and institutions lies in the functioning of the human subject, and as long as the moral revolutionist, declares Foster with impressive finality,

"As long as he is condemned to depend, for the efficacy of his schemes, on the aid of so much pure propensity as he shall find in the corrupted subject, he will be nearly in the case of a man attempting to climb a tree by laying hold, first on this side, and then on that, of some rotten twig, which still breaks off in his hand, and lets him fall among the nettles."³⁶

Such is the religious and ethical, the general sociological manifestation of a certain universal tendency in humanity, the tendency which Foster, in the light of the general spiritual upheaval of his time, significantly denominated romantic. All unconsciously, it would seem, we have merely echoed him whenever we have attempted comprehensive interpretation of the romantic movement. At least our contemporary neo-humanist appraisal of romanticism, from the eighteenth century to the present, can find its fundamental positions outlined with startling pointedness in him. For

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 308 and cf. quotation from Godwin, p. 315 n.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 318.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 310.

he is concerned primarily not with the new literary fashions, however significant and important they may be, but with the momentous shifting of thought, the sudden widening of vision, the liberation of imagination, however we choose to describe the revolutionary attitude of his time. He sees romanticism as the age-long expression of human restlessness; as waywardness; as rebellion against brute fact and the attendant effort to escape and transcend the grind of ordinary experience; as longing for some Utopia based on generous and ardent, though tragically ungrounded, confidence in human goodness; and so as the substitution of sympathy for discipline and coercion both in the individual and in the social organism. All this he sees as a perennial urge; and the particular developments of it affecting every aspect of experience he binds together by a term which the eighteenth century had made increasingly comprehensive though still vague. His synthesis was nothing less than an inspiration; all these tendencies revealing the ascendancy of the imagination or feeling over reason he grouped within the term romantic.

I am not sure how far we have progressed beyond Foster in our interpretation of the movements inspired by this common fundamental impulse. Consider his insight into romantic egotism, romantic revery, romantic imagination, his unmasking of romantic belief in human goodness and in the sway of sympathy and benevolence, his consequent exposure of the fallacy of romantic humanitarianism. We must then grant him the title of pioneer in the interpretation of the English romantic revolt. That he was a conscious prophet, that he recognized a coherent stream in which many tributaries merged, I do not for a moment contend. He could hardly foresee the drift which we with our perspective can perceive; the phrase "romantic movement" would not occur to him, although he would, I believe, have caught its significance with quicker insight than most of his contemporaries. Even if my large claims for him be accepted only with reservations, the mere treatment of the subject,—and, it should be insisted, at such length,—as well as the uniqueness of the attempt at this time, cannot be overlooked. Not until Hazlitt's significant importation of Schlegel's exposition of the classical and romantic eleven years later³⁷

³⁷ See note 3 above.

do we meet anything approaching it even remotely. This fact in itself makes Foster's eclipse the more incomprehensible. That he was widely read is attested by the no less than thirty-five editions through which the essays passed.³⁸ Such men as Horne Tooke,³⁹ Joseph Cottle,⁴⁰ and De Quincey⁴¹ mentioned his work with admiration, and De Quincey, indeed, wrote an essay about him devoting a paragraph to the essay before us, but none of his contemporaries apparently saw any significance in the "epithet romantic"; they were unconscious of the correlation of the movements which they themselves so strikingly embodied. They simply did not grasp the relation of the term to the currents which swept them along.⁴²

³⁸ Foster was one of the best known essayists in the greatest period of the English essay, contributing 186 articles on a very wide range of subjects to the *Eclectic Review*, from 1806 to 1839. A selection of 59 of these was published in two volumes under the title *Biographical, Literary, and Philosophical Essays; contributed to the Eclectic Review by John Foster*, in 1843; an American edition containing 20 appeared in 1844. This volume and also *Lectures delivered at Broadmead Chapel, Bristol, by John Foster*, London, 1845, 2nd ed., and the *Life and Correspondence of John Foster*, edited by J. E. Ryland, 2 vols., London, 1848, are not uncommon in American bookshops. His popularity is further demonstrated by the publication of *Fosteriana, consisting of Thoughts, Reflections, and Criticisms of John Foster*, ed. by Henry G. Bohn, 2 vols., 1858, 2d ed., 1877.

Of the essays with which we are concerned here at least one American edition appeared, that reprinted from the 7th London edition, at Andover, 1826.

³⁹ See *Life of Foster*, cited above, I, 244.

⁴⁰ In *Reminiscences of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Robert Southey*, 1848, Introd., pp. xi-xii, Joseph Cottle exclaims:

"The whole of the events thus recorded, appear through the dim vista of memory, already with the scenes before the flood! while all the busy, the aspiring and the intellectual spirits here noticed, and once so well known, have hurried off our mortal stage!—Robert Lovell!—George Burnet!—Charles Lloyd!—George Catcott!—Dr. Beddoes!—Charles Danvers!—Amos Cottle!—William Gilbert!—John Morgan!—Ann Yearsley!—Sir H. Davy!—Hannah More!—Robert Hall!—Samuel Taylor Coleridge!—Charles Lamb!—Thomas Poole!—Josiah Wade!—Robert Southey!—and John Foster!"

⁴¹ In *The Works of Thomas DeQuincey*, 12 vols., Boston, 1853, vol. VI, *Biographical and Historical Essays*, pp. 348-355. The presence of Foster amid such a group as Shakspeare, Goethe, Schiller, Lamb, Hazlitt, Godwin, Shelley, and Keats in this famous volume would appear sufficient to lead students back to the subject of our study here.

⁴² Yet almost everyone interested at the time must have seen or heard of the essay, for three editions were called for in less than a year.

Foster is no more fortunate later in the nineteenth century.⁴³

Any direct influence of the essay in shaping ideas of the romantic I am unable to find. Yet I cannot but think it had unconscious influence which emerges later from underground and colors thought. The essay seems strikingly parallel to Young's "Conjectures on Original Composition," a document without apparent influence in England in its own generation, lost to sight for almost one hundred and fifty years and suddenly recognized in our time as a turning point in criticism.⁴⁴ Foster may well merit a similar recognition. For practically unaided by the past or his own time, he by sheer penetration put a new content, a whole new set of values into the old term. Within its suddenly widened scope he ranged and correlated those modes of thought and feeling which we now call the characteristics of romanticism. Whatever his influence, then, he must be accorded the place of the English pioneer in the interpretation of the romantic.

American University.

PAUL KAUFMAN.

ALTE UND NEUE WORTGESCHICHTEN

Allvater M. Nachbildung von altnord. (*Edda*) *alfaðir* (*alföðr*) 'Wodan'; seit Klopstock¹ 1769 *Hermannsschlacht* VIII, XII in der Dichtersprache geläufig, z. B. Schiller 1782 *Semele* v. 543 (= Zeus); Cramer 1796 *Raphael Pfau* II, 2. S. 528 und seit Campe 1807 gebucht und belegt.

⁴³ Robert Hall's review of Foster's Essays, in *The Miscellaneous Works and Remains of Robert Hall*, 1846, pp. 427-447, approves the essay intelligently, but is oblivious to its real bearing.

The most competent and sympathetic, though doubtless over-favorable estimate of Foster, is in George Gilfillan's *Gallery of Literary Portraits*, 1845, pp. 163-183. It is to be noted that Gilfillan includes him among the twenty-six "immortals" of the period 1790-1830, all of whom with the exception of Thomas Aird are far better remembered at present. Like Hall he shows no recognition of the significance of this essay.

⁴⁴ Recent references to the importance of Young are gathered by the present writer in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, April, 1918, XVII, pp. 298-304.

¹ Das Wort ist jedoch nicht von Klopstock gebildet, wie z. B. Weigand-Hirt 1909 *Deu. Wbch.* I, 43 angibt, sondern erscheint schon bei Gottsched 1749 *Neuer Büchersaal* VIII, 85: Odin heisst Allvater. Vgl. Reichel 1909 *Gottsched-Wbch.* I, 136.—W. K.

Blindekuh F. erst bei Klein 1792 *Provinzialwb.* I, 53 gebucht und bei Campe 1807, der es aber unter *blind* einordnet;² ältere Schreibung seit frühnhd. Zeit *blinde Kuh*: so seit Luther oft belegt, z. B. Fischart 1590 *Gargantua* S. 262 und Jul. v. Braunschweig 1593 *Von einem Wirte* (Holland) S. 329. Siber 1579 *Gemma* S. 146 bezeichnet *blinde Kuh* als obersächsisch; aber oberdeutsch gilt vielfach *blinde Maus* (z. B. Schnüffis 1695 *Maul-Trummel* S. 211) mhd. *blinde miuse* (Fischart 1575 S. 259) und *Blinzelmaus*. Zu *blinde Kuh* verzeichnet Stieler 1691 als Synonyma auch *Blinzelkuh*, *Wischau*, und *Guckenbergen*.

Hain², Hein(e) verbreitete Kurzform für Heinrich als Familien- und Taufnamen: in der Verbindung "Freund Hain" euphemistische Bezeichnung des Todes wie schweiz. *Beinheinrich*, *Idiotikon* II, 1315. Seit der 2. Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts bezeugt auf einem anonymen Flugblatt: "Freund Hain lässt sich abwenden nit Mit Gewalt, mit Gut, mit Trew, noch Bitt Und braucht ohn all Barmherzigkeit Gegen jedermann hie Oberkeit" (*Illustr. deu. Monatshefte*, Juli 1872 S. 381 = K. Braun, Wiesbaden, *Aus der Mappe eines deutschen Reichsbürgers*, Hannover 1874 II, 157). Seit 1770 Literaturwort nach dem Vorgang von Matth. Claudius 1774 *Sämtl. Werke* I/II, 81 "wenn Freund Hain mit der Hippe kommt." Claudius schwankt zwischen *Hain* und *Freund Hain* im Vorwort zum 1. Bande und in dem Gedicht "Nach der Krankheit" 1777 *Werke* III, 158/59. Vgl. auch 1788 *Felsenburg*, ein *sittl. unterhaltendes Lesebuch* I, 3; Bretzner 1788 *Leben eines Lüderlichen* III, 56, 173, 235, 469.

Heiland² M. 'Mond': "Heiland nennen die Bauren uff den Schwartz-Walt und im Preyßgau den Mon, wenn sie ihn ehrerbietig nennen wollen" Grimmelshausen 1670 *Calender* S. 60; vgl. Zehner 1622 *Nomencl.* S. 133 "Luna, der Mond, vulgo der Heyland." Sonst unbezeugt. Nicht eins mit *Heiland¹*, das wäre Blasphemie; vielmehr verwandt mit frühahd. (*Gl. Ker.*) *heilanti* *heilantlih* 'heilsam' = angl. *hálwende hálwynde* 'heilsam' (über-wand als Suffix vgl. meine *Stammbildungslehre* 2. Aufl. § 245). Die ehrerbietige Begrüßung des Mondes war von Hutabnehmen begleitet (Wuttke, *Volksaberglaube der Gegenwart* 3. Aufl. S. 11).

²Schon Steinbach 1734 *Deu. Wbch.* I, 133 bucht: die blinde Kuh spielen, *velatis oculis alios capere*. Nach Reichel 1909 *Gottsched-Wbch.* I, 857 bedeutet *Blindekuh* bei Gottsched 1741 ein Kartenspiel.—W. K.

Als Ansprache bedeutete unser Wort wohl den gekürzten Wunschsatz: "Sei Heilbringer oder heilbringend!"

Jammertal N. 'Erde, irdisches Leben' mhd. *jâmertal* N.; der Dichtersprache des höfischen Rittertums noch fremd; um 1300 oft in Hugo von Trimbergs *Renner* und seitdem in religiösen Texten besonders auch bei Luther (z. B. Ps. 84, 7) und im protest. Kirchenlied viel gebraucht. Sonstige Belege: Schnüffis 1695 *Maul-Trummel* S. 6; M. Claudius *Sämtl. Werke* v, 161, 216. Quelle lat. *vallis lacrymarum*, Psalm 83, 7.

Kaiserschnitt M. als medizinischer Fachausdruck nach lat. *sectio caesarea*: vor Campe 1808 von den Wbb. nicht gebucht. Beleg: M. Claudius 1777 *Sämtl. Werke* III, 110. Dafür älter *kaiserlicher Schnitt* Heister 1739 *Chirurgie* S. 647. Das mittelalterliche *sectio caesarea* (= engl. *caesarean section* und frz. *opération césarienne*) beruht auf einer alten Überlieferung (Plin. *Nat. hist.*), wonach Jul. Caesar (geb. 100 v. Chr.) durch Kaiserschnitt zur Welt kam. Typus der Wortübersetzung wie bei *Zankapfel*.

Keilschrift F. Bezeichnung der aus keilförmigen Buchstaben bestehenden altpersischen Schrift der Achämeniden, als geläufiges Wort literarisch zuerst verwendet in den anonymen Mitteilungen über G. F. Grotefends Schrift über die Entzifferung der Darius-Inschriften von Persepolis (*Praevia de cuneatis quas vocant inscriptionibus Persepolitanis legendis et explicandis relatio*) in den *Göttinger Gel. Anzeigen* 1802 S. 1481 ff. und S. 1769 ff.; 1803 S. 593, 1161 (allerdings wurde diese Schrift erst 1893 im lat. Wortlaut gedruckt). Seitdem regelmässig im Gebrauch z. B. auch in Grotefends eigenem deutschen Bericht über seine Entzifferung in des Göttinger Historikers Heeren *Ideen über den Handel der alten Welt*² (1805) I, 931-960. In dem Reisewerk von Karstens Niebuhr 1776 begegnen die Bezeichnungen *Keilschrift* und *Keil-inschrift* bei der Erwähnung der persischen Inschriften noch nicht. Wahrscheinlich ist unser Wort eine Nachbildung des schon früher durchgedrungenen *Bilderschrift*. Beleg: Kotzebue 1807 *Kleine Romane* usw. ("Des Pfarrers Tochter") I, 25 "Die Grabschriften mussten wohl schwer zu entziffern seyn, da er an mancher so lange studierte, als sey es Keilschrift aus Persepolis."

Nymphe F. seit Opitz zunächst gelehrtes Fremdwort der neueren Dichtersprache aus lat. *nympha*, zur Bezeichnung mythischer Mädchen der antiken Götterwelt und seit dem 18. Jahrh. auch

für junge Mädchen mit gutem oder bösem Nebensinn. Sekundär (zool.) 'Libelle, Jungfer' Richey 1755 *Hamb. Idiotikon* S. 105—'Puppe, Larve' Campe 1813;³ (gynaecol.) 'Schamlippe' Heister 1739 *Chirurgie* S. 764.

Sensenmann M. dichterisch für 'Tod'; seit Stieler 1691 gebucht; im 17./18. Jahrh. beliebt, z. B. Weise 1673 *Erznarren* S. 156; Bretzner 1790 *Leben eines Lüderlichen* I, 259; III, 236, 275. Das Wort (eigentlich 'Schnitter') beruht auf dem Volkslied vom Schnitter Tod vom Jahre 1638 ("Es ist ein Schnitter, der heisst Tod" *Wunderhorn*). Durch das 16. Jahrh. wurde der Tod in bildlichen Darstellungen z. B. der Totentänze mit der Sense gekennzeichnet. Vgl. auch *Knochenmann* und *Streckebein*.

Waldeinsamkeit F. Wortschöpfung Tiecks 1797 (*Volksmärchen hrsg. v. Peter Leberecht* I, 209 = *Phantasia* I, 152, "Märchen vom blonden Eckbert"); dann Modewort der Romantiker geworden, auch Heine 1851 *Romanzero* S. 391 (Elster). Jüngere Gegenstücke *Bergeinsamkeit* Tieck 1825 *Gedichte* III, 220, *Alpeneinsamkeit* Heine *Werke* VI, 434 (Elster) und *Feldeinsamkeit* als Überschrift eines Gedichtes von Allmers 1860 (vertont von Brahms); neuerdings auch bei Sanders *Dorfeinsamkeit*.

Zankapfel M. nach dem Vorbild von lat. *pomum Eridis* (z. B. Leibniz *Deu. Schr.* I, 198) in der 2. Hälfte des 16. Jahrh. aufgekommen, aber erst seit Kindleben 1781 *Studentenlexikon* S. 241 gebucht. Frühster Beleg nach A. Gombert (Progr. v. Gr. Strehlitz 1879 S. 23) *Warhafter Bericht* 1570 "sie wollten zum wenigsten ein neu Pomum Eridos, das ist, wie sie es gedeutscht, ein Zankapfel in hauffen werffen"; Zinkgraf 1653 *Apophthegmata* I, 53; Arnold 1699 *Ketzerhistorie* I, 688^a; Jean Paul 1793 *Grönl. Prozesse* I, 67—1796 *Siebenkäs* S. 26. Anspielung auf die Göttin Eris, die auf der Hochzeit des Peleus und der Thetis einen Apfel mit der Aufschrift "der Schönsten" unter die Göttinnen Hera, Athene und Aphrodite wirft. Humanistisches Wortgebilde des Typus *Leitfaden*; vgl. auch *Kaiserschnitt* und *Adamsapfel*.

F. KLUGE.

Freiburg, Baden.

³ In dieser Bedeutung schon bei Adelung 1777 *Wbch.* I, 856 und Nemnich 1793 *Polyglotten-Lexicon* II, 1092.—W. K.

A SHAKESPEAREAN MEASURE OF MORALITY

Some of the moral comments on Angelo, in *Measure for Measure*, make one recall, almost inevitably, the epigram of Hazlitt: "If we wish to know the force of human genius we should read Shakespeare. If we wish to see the insignificance of human learning we may study his commentators." Even Coleridge turns tedious pulpit on this play. But it is refreshing to note that Sir Walter Raleigh says: "This is indeed the everlasting difficulty of Shakespeare criticism, that the critics are so much more moral than Shakespeare himself, and so much less experienced."

Angelo is a study in Puritanism and hypocrisy, but he is not a wholly despicable hypocrite. As Falstaff might say, he is an "ill angel," a counterfeit coin. If we see the play on the stage, adequately presented, I suspect that we shall be compelled to revise our prudish attitude toward its central problem and agree with John Masefield, himself a fine and unflinching poet and moralist, that *Measure for Measure* is constructed "closely and subtly for the stage," and is "one of the greatest works of the greatest English mind."

Any comment on Angelo must begin with a recognition that he is still a young man, perhaps under thirty. It is only five years since he violated his promise to wed Mariana. April is in his blood, and the beauty and purity of Isabella awaken it with a suddenness that seems astonishing but is, in the circumstances, merely natural. Shakespeare nowhere refers to him as old, or even as middle-aged. Angelo does not say, as Othello does: "The natural affects [passions] in me defunct." His hesitancy to assume his duties as deputy is apparently due in part to realization of youth:

Let there be some more test made of my metal,
Before so noble and so great a figure
Be stamped upon it.

Is this a self-confident Polonius or a master of hypocrisy like Claudius? But the Duke is obdurate. Lord Angelo must assume the reins of government. Will he prove worthy of absolute authority? The Duke's intent, and Shakespeare's intent, are set clearly before us:

Hence shall we see,
If power change purpose, what our seemers be.

Such a theme is didactic. Indeed, Walter Pater observes that traces of the old Morality play survive in *Measure for Measure* and give it a peculiar ethical interest.

The drama was written, apparently, at about the same time as *Hamlet*; and the guilty passion of Angelo is curiously allied to that of Claudius and Gertrude, which, to Hamlet, turns the whole world into an unweeded garden possessed by "things rank and gross in nature." Angelo, like Claudius, is finally disgusted with himself; his deeds smell to heaven, and, going further than the Danish monarch, he welcomes death. Isabella herself defends him:

I partly think
A due sincerity governed his deeds,
Till he did look on me: since it is so,
Let him not die.

To maintain a prudish attitude toward such a character is impossible. Before we condemn Angelo let us understand him.

For such an understanding Shakespeare has given us ample data. To quote Mr. Masfield again, the temptation to sexual sin "is mixed up with every generosity. It is a flood in the heart and a blinding wave over the eyes. It is the thorn in the side under the cloak of the beauty of youth. In Shakespeare's vision it is a natural force incident to youth, as April is incident to the year." And no amount of rereading of the play will show that Angelo is declined into the vale of life. As Isabella, with the courage of innocence, says, he is

Drest in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assured.

Temptation comes upon him suddenly. The courtesan has never stirred his blood, but this virtuous maid subdues him quite. "What dost thou, or what art thou, Angelo?" he cries. Lying by the violet in the sun, he is corrupted "with virtuous season." His struggle is apparently so brief as to be no struggle. He is astonished to find that he has no real defences. "Blood, thou art blood," he exclaims. We have indeed found out "what our seemers be." Isabella, it may be retorted, maintains her purity; but she maintains it at no cost to herself. Duty and inclination do not come nobly to the grapple. She feels for Angelo neither

love nor passion. Yet she consents, seemingly, to marry the Duke at the end of the play. "Get thee to a nunnery!" cries Hamlet to Ophelia; and in our memory echoes that magical line from an earlier play,

Chanting faint hymns to the cold, fruitless moon.

But Isabella forsakes the nunnery which she has been about to enter. Each to his own solution of the moral problems of life, says Shakespeare. For Antony and for Cleopatra "the bright day is done," and they are for the dark. Not so Isabella or even Angelo. In *Measure for Measure*, the cloud lifts, and our discontent is made glorious summer at the end. Thanks to the Duke's interposition, Angelo's act

Did not o'ertake his bad intent,
And must be buried but as an intent
That perished by the way.

These are Isabella's words; and we cannot condemn Angelo without tacitly condemning her also. Indeed, Johnson, incorruptible moralist, does condemn her: the play seems to inculcate the lesson, he says, "that women think ill of nothing that raises the credit of their beauty, and are ready, however virtuous, to pardon any act which they think incited by their own charms."

O virtuous lexicographer! In the dictionary of thy youth was there no such word as tolerance? In old age, the heyday in the blood is tame and humble, and waits upon the judgment; but what a judgment is Johnson's! Isabella needs no defence. As the tainted Lucio says, she is "enskiéd and sainted." But she is no Puritan. Like Hamlet, she would use us much better than we deserve, else who should scape whipping? Angelo's intention was incited by the charm of her beauty and innocence, and the walls of his fancied moral security evaporated like a mist; for it was a security formed of "such stuff as dreams are made on." Like Shakespeare's later creation, Desdemona, Isabella is so modest in her passion of purity that she abhors to name the sin to which Angelo would tempt her. Even the apparently inevitable execution of her brother does not move her to compromise with the treason of the blood. "More than our brother is our chastity," she exclaims. Like so many of Shakespeare's women, she leaves us with a feeling of astonishment and admiration. She is a

prophecy of Shakespeare's finished study in true virtue, Imogen. In the presence of such secure souls we can forget Mr. Masfield's phrase about the difficulty of doing justice "in a world of animals swayed by rumor." For in Isabella "the ape and tiger die." We are no longer in a world of animals but in one of spirits.

Angelo, however, is not, even at the end of the play, an attractive character. He is not like Hamlet, or even Antony—that Antony of whom one of his admirers says:

A rarer spirit never
Did steer humanity; but you, gods, will give us
Some faults to make us men.

No, Angelo is not of these heroic proportions. But he is not despicable; he is merely "the prenzie Angelo"—a phrase which Claudio uses and which, significantly enough, his sister repeats. Angelo is a model of propriety, one of the "unco guid." "Prim" seems to be almost an equivalent of "prenzie," which is apparently a Scotch term allied to Burns' "primsie" and was possibly used by Shakespeare to please the Scotch king, James. In fact, the whole play and its Scriptural title constitute a kind of abbreviated King James version of the Scriptures. Angelo, though a hypocrite, is a hypocrite almost in spite of himself, not a finished and consummate type like Claudius in *Hamlet*. His is but a 'prentice hand'; he cannot carry it off like the seasoned villain. There is nothing of Iago's diabolical determination in him at the end. Although he braves it out to the moment when the disguised Duke is unhooded and confronts him, his acknowledgment of guilt is then complete and sincere. And he does not beg for clemency:

I crave death more willingly than mercy;
'Tis my deserving, and I do entreat it.

This is a perfect humility of soul which a good actor, however sudden the transition may seem, can make at least partly convincing. A Shakespearean comedy permits these quick conversions; no one will forget that of the usurping duke who meets a holy hermit on the outskirts of the forest of Arden. Sudden repentance is a dramatic convention almost necessary to the so-called "happy ending." A tragedy has greater truth to nature, but forgiveness is always beyond nature.

We must remember also that Angelo is only temporarily obsessed

with passion, as Hamlet is obsessed with melancholy. Neither is in his natural and healthy state. We are shown merely one brief period in their lives, with a hint of the before and after—in Hamlet, only the former. Of Angelo before his temptation Escalus, a wise and aged counselor, says:

If any in Vienna be of worth
To undergo such ample grace and honor,
It is Lord Angelo.

And his modesty upon receiving the authority of the Duke has already been mentioned. It is a genuine, not a hypocritical, modesty and gives us a most pleasing introduction to the man. When Isabella threatens to denounce him to the world, he reminds her that his reputation is so blameless that she will not be believed. She tacitly admits this. Angelo's obsession, then, must not be taken as an accurate index to his character. While obsessed, he is extraordinarily cruel and tyrannical; he even orders the execution of Claudio after he has promised Isabella to release him; for he fears that a brother's rage will mean vengeance upon himself. This, some may say, is mere sensationalism—Shakespeare's concession to the groundlings. But, when the blood burns, no vow is sacred—as old Polonius reminds Ophelia. At any rate, Shakespeare, with a fine irony, makes Angelo commit the very sin for which he would have Claudio's life, and commit it unconsciously; for Mariana, to whom he had been affianced, is substituted for Isabella at a midnight assignation, and the Duke later forces Angelo to marry her. The wheel has come full circle. Mariana, offered a better husband, craves, she says, "no other, nor no better man." Like a true realist, she enters wedlock wisely, with no illusions—feeling, apparently, that our virtues would be proud if our faults whipped them not.

Whether she reconciles us wholly to her moral choice is still a fair question; but I find amusement in the confession of a modern editor who thinks that Shakespeare "intends us to forgive Angelo, and regard him as a converted character." Such editorial humility is so rare as it is welcome. "Genius begins," says Leslie Stephen, "where intellect ends." Shakespeare often begins where schoolmasters end. Let us all admit that he perhaps knew what he was about, not merely when he wrote *Hamlet* or *Othello* but

when he wrote *Measure for Measure* and *Cymbeline*. Although he does not bestow so much pains on the portrait of Angelo as on that of Hamlet, and may have been revising an earlier drama by himself or another, he produces a sharp impression, an impression which requires the stage for its full vindication. It is a pity that this play is seldom performed, for it is full of dramatic felicities and contains several long passages which equal the best in Shakespeare.

HARRY T. BAKER.

Goucher College.

A NOTE ON COLERIDGE'S SHAKESPEARE CRITICISM

That Coleridge's literary criticism owes much of its significance to keen psychological analysis is a fact that has now for some time been generally recognized. In 1912 Professor Oliver Elton noted that Coleridge's psychological genius accounted for much of his best aesthetic criticism, mentioning specifically his analyses of the characters of Shakespeare's plays.¹ A little later we find C. E. Vaughan going so far as to assert that Coleridge's "records of the working of the mind, especially under abnormal or morbid conditions, are extraordinarily minute and subtle," and that "it would hardly be too much to say that he is the founder of what has since become a distinct . . . branch of philosophy: the study of experimental psychology."² Other students of Coleridge might be cited. And yet, so far as I am aware, no thorough-going attempt has been made to classify his psychological comments and formulate the underlying principles.

This is not to be wondered at, for Coleridge's variety of eclecticism was such as to baffle most attempts to get at fundamental principles. But recent developments in psychological thinking have been rapidly bringing to consciousness principles that do—we must now admit—to some extent integrate Coleridge's scattered comments, and make classification, at least within a limited field, seem perhaps worth while. Looking at his criticism in the light of our contemporary functional psychology we see interesting

¹ *Survey of English Literature, 1830-1880*, Vol. II, pp. 106, 120-121.

² *Cambridge History of English Literature*, XI, p. 152.

anticipations of a fairly definable psychological point of view. Many of Coleridge's comments anticipate, both in substance and in phraseology, the tendency of the functional school to "get rid of *externality* in psychology,"³ to talk in terms of vital activity rather than externally "given" elements, in terms of significance rather than mere facts. A number of these parallel rather remarkably the utterances of the present-day abnormal psychologists who find significance rather than accident even in errors, and explain the pathological and the vicious in terms of normal vital functions vitiated only by deficiencies, repressions, or some similar interference.

Such passages frequently bear witness to Coleridge's persistent attempt to do away with philosophic dualism, to prove to himself that extremes do meet, to reconcile all opposites.⁴ This is entirely natural, for the contemporary thought tendency referred to is really the modern, psychological rather than metaphysical, way of resolving dualism. It shows itself as the attempt, now to explain the objective or external—reality as grasped by the intellect—in terms of vital activity; now to explain the conscious in terms of the subconscious; and now to explain the pathological in terms of the normal, the destructive in terms of the constructive or creative.

I have tabulated Coleridge's comments, taken from the notes on Shakespeare's plays, that anticipate rather strikingly this modern psychological attempt at monism. In each there is evidence that Coleridge was conscious of some dualism to be dealt with; there is always some pair of opposing elements or some contradiction to be reconciled, or something vaguely but truly paradoxical in its implications. But, unlike many of his metaphysical attempts to reconcile opposites, these psychological attempts have given a body of doctrine that must be recognized as relatively sound and significant at the present time.

Since the modern parallels that the comments will suggest are, many times, to be found in the field of abnormal psychology, it is worth while to note at the outset that Coleridge was himself con-

³ The phrase is Professor Dewey's.

⁴ A more comprehensive survey of Coleridge's attempts to reconcile philosophic opposites will be found in my study, "The Critical Principle of the Reconciliation of Opposites as Employed by Coleridge," No. ix of the *Contributions to Rhetorical Theory*, edited by F. N. Scott, of the University of Michigan.

scious that he was dealing in abnormal psychology. In his comparison of Chaucer and Shakespeare he remarked: "Shakspeare's characters are the representatives of the interior nature of humanity, in which some element has become so predominant as to destroy the health of the mind."⁵ This very statement is a significant anticipation of the view of one of our contemporary psychologists who notes that among others Iago, Richard III, Macbeth, Hamlet, Anthony, and Timon "can all be studied like patients suffering from neuroses."⁶

I

In handling the question of motive Coleridge frequently tends to discount the obvious external motive, stressing instead the temperament or predisposition of the individual, once or twice even suggesting that the external motive is deliberately created by what the contemporary abnormal psychologist would probably call the "unconscious." The paradoxical phrase "motive-mongering" used in the following *Hamlet* note gives the essence of his conception. On the King's lines (Act 3, scene 3) "My words fly up, my thoughts remain below: Words, without thoughts, never to heaven go," Coleridge comments:

"O what a lesson concerning the essential difference between wishing and willing, and the folly of all motive-mongering, while the individual self remains!"⁷

Similarly, to Iago's soliloquy (*Othello*, Act 1, scene 3), "I hate the Moor; . . . I know not if't be true; But I, for mere suspicion in that kind, Will do't as if for surety," Coleridge applies the paradoxical phrase "the motive-hunting of a motiveless malignity."⁸ It is possible, of course, that here Coleridge conceived the "motive-hunting" merely as a means of justifying the proposed action to others, not as the attempt of a blind malignity to furnish itself with a motive for action; but that the latter conception was in his mind seems likely from the use of the same phrase in one of the *Anima Poetae* notes, where Coleridge says that in dealing

⁵ *Works*, N. Y., 1856-75, Vol. iv, p. 246.

⁶ Mordell. *The Erotic Motive in Literature*.

⁷ *Works*, iv, 161. The following notes are all taken from the section entitled "Shakspeare, with Introductory Matter on Poetry, the Drama, and the Stage," in Vol. iv of this edition.

⁸ *Ib.*, p. 181.

with suicide we usually try to "fish out some *motive* for an act which proceeded from a *motive-making* impulse."⁹

The difference between the supposed cause and the real germ of action lies at the bottom of Coleridge's comments on the dialogue between Banquo and Macbeth just after the disappearance of the witches (*Macbeth*, Act 1, scene 3).

"... Banquo goes on wondering, like any common spectator:

Were such things here as we do speak about?

whilst Macbeth persists in recurring to the self-concerning:—

Your children shall be kings.

Ban. You shall be king.

Macb. And thane of Cawdor too: went it not so?

So surely is the guilt in its germ anterior to the supposed cause, and immediate temptation!"

And later,

"Then he relapses into himself again, and every word of his soliloquy shows the early birth-date of his guilt."¹⁰

Finally, in a note on *Romeo and Juliet* Coleridge commends Shakespeare for introducing Romeo as "already love-bewildered" before the introduction of Juliet, for

"The necessity of loving creates an object for itself," and "no one . . . ever experiences any shock at Romeo's forgetting his Rosaline, who had been a mere name for the yearning of his youthful imagination, and rushing into his passion for Juliet."¹¹

II

Mood, and even intellectual conviction, ordinarily conceived as forced on the individual by something beyond his control, are sometimes seen by Coleridge as the deliberate creations of an inner self. Note the phrasing of the following comment on Macbeth's speech after the death of Lady Macbeth (Act 5, scene 5):

"Alas for Macbeth! now all is inward with him; he has no more prudential prospective reasonings. His wife, the only being

⁹ *Anima Poetae*. London, 1895, p. 196.

¹⁰ *Works*. Vol. iv, p. 168.

¹¹ *Ib.*, p. 111.

who could have had any seat in his affections, dies; he *puts on despondency, the final heart-armor of the wretched*, and would fain think every thing shadowy and unsubstantial, as indeed all things are to those who cannot regard them as symbols of goodness:—

Out, out, brief candle!

Life's but a walking shadow; . . ."¹²

In explaining the contradiction between the weightiness of the occasion and the triviality of mood in *Hamlet* Act 1, scene 4, Coleridge writes:

"The unimportant conversation with which this scene opens is a proof of Shakspeare's minute knowledge of human nature. It is a well-established fact, that on the brink of any serious enterprise, or event of moment, men almost invariably endeavor to elude the pressure of their own thoughts by turning aside to trivial objects and familiar circumstances: thus this dialogue on the platform begins with remarks on the coldness of the air, and inquiries, obliquely connected, indeed, with the expected hour of the visitation, but thrown out in a seeming vacuity of topics, as to the striking of the clock and so forth. The same desire to escape from the impending thought is carried on in Hamlet's account of, and moralizing on, the Danish custom of wassailing: he runs off from the particular to the universal, and in his repugnance to personal and individual concerns, escapes, as it were, from himself in generalizations, and smothers the impatience and uneasy feelings of the moment in abstract reasoning."¹³

Of the lines (Act 1, scene 5) "*Mar.* Hillo, ho, ho, my lord!
Ham. Hillo, ho, ho, boy! come bird, come . . ." he notes:

"This part of the scene after Hamlet's interview with the Ghost has been charged with an improbable eccentricity. But the truth is, that after the mind has been stretched beyond its usual pitch and tone, it must either sink into exhaustion or inanity, or seek relief by change. It is thus well known, that persons conversant in deeds of cruelty contrive to escape from conscience by connecting something of the ludicrous with them, and by inventing grotesque terms and a certain technical phraseology to disguise the horror of their practices. Indeed, paradoxical as it may appear, the terrible by a law of the human mind always touches on the verge of the ludicrous."¹⁴

In *The Tempest* Act 2, scene 1, Coleridge says that Shakespeare has,

¹² *Ib.*, p. 174. The italics are mine.

¹³ *Ib.*, p. 154.

¹⁴ *Ib.*, p. 155-6.

"as in many other places, shown the tendency in bad men to indulge in scorn and contemptuous expressions, as a mode of getting rid of their own uneasy feelings of inferiority to the good."¹⁵

Reading these passages to-day one is half surprised not to find mention of "defense reactions" as such.

III

Nowhere, perhaps, does Coleridge more nearly approach the contemporary standpoint than in some of his explanations of the vices, faults, and tragic weaknesses of Shakespeare's characters. The paradoxical law that certain positive, essentially moral forces may, when coexistent with some inner weakness or some peculiarity of environment, result in anti-social and even criminal acts, was clearly recognized by Coleridge, and we find him explaining such acts as the distortion of what is fundamentally wholesome. His note on Act I, scene 4 of *Richard II* reads:

"In this scene a new light is thrown on Richard's character. Until now he has appeared in all the beauty of royalty; but here, as soon as he is left to himself, the inherent weakness of his character is immediately shown. It is a weakness, however, of a peculiar kind, not arising from want of personal courage, or any specific defect of faculty, but rather an intellectual feminineness, which feels a necessity of ever leaning on the breasts of others, and of reclining on those who are all the while known to be inferiors. To this must be attributed . . . all Richard's vices, his tendency to concealment, and his cunning, the whole operation of which is directed to the getting rid of present difficulties. . . . Shakespeare has represented this character in a very peculiar manner. He has not made him amiable with counterbalancing faults; but has openly and broadly drawn those faults without reserve, relying on Richard's disproportionate sufferings and gradually emergent good qualities for our sympathy; and this was possible, because his faults are not positive vices, but spring entirely from defect of character."¹⁶

Lear's attitude toward his daughters is explained as the distortion of a kindly and loving nature. In speaking of the "moral verities" on which the play is founded Coleridge notes

"the strange, yet by no means unnatural, mixture of selfishness, sensibility, and habit of feeling derived from, and fostered by, the particular rank and usages of the individual;—the intense desire

¹⁵ *Ib.*, p. 77.

¹⁶ *Ib.*, p. 123-4.

of being intensely beloved,—selfish, and yet characteristic of the selfishness of a loving and kindly nature alone;—the self-supportless leaning for all pleasure on another's breast;—the craving after sympathy with a prodigal disinterestedness, frustrated by its own ostentation, and the mode and nature of its claims;—the anxiety, the distrust, the jealousy, which more or less accompany all selfish affections, and are amongst the surest contradistinctions of mere fondness from true love, and which originate Lear's eager wish to enjoy his daughter's violent professions, whilst the inveterate habits of sovereignty convert the wish into claim and positive right, and an incomppliance with them into crime and treason.”¹⁷

The distortion of some positive force—a will-to-power as it were—is used to account even for Oliver's apparently wholly vicious speech about Orlando just after his interview with Charles (*As You Like It*, Act 1, scene 1). Of the lines “Yet he's gentle; never school'd, and yet learned; full of noble device; . . .” Coleridge notes:

“It is too venturous to charge a passage in Shakspeare with want of truth to nature; and yet at first sight this speech of Oliver's expresses truths, which it seems almost impossible that any mind should so distinctly, so lively, and so voluntarily, have presented to itself in connection with feelings and intentions so malignant, and so contrary to those which the qualities expressed would naturally have called forth. But I dare not say that this seeming unnaturalness is not in the nature of an abused wilfulness, when united with a strong intellect. In such characters there is sometimes a gloomy self-gratification in making the absoluteness of the will (*sit pro ratione voluntas!*) evident to themselves by setting the reason and the conscience in full array against it.”¹⁸

Madness itself is shown to be simply a variation of its opposite. Of *Hamlet* Act 4, scene 2 Coleridge notes:

“Hamlet's madness is made to consist in the free utterance of all the thoughts that had passed through his mind before;—in fact, in telling home-truths.”¹⁹

And in one of the notes on *Macbeth* the opposites *hope* and *fear* are shown to have an identical basis:

“Hope, the master element of a commanding genius, meeting with an active and combining intellect, and an imagination of just that degree of vividness which disquiets and impels the soul to try to realize its images, greatly increases the creative power of the mind; and hence the images become a satisfying world of themselves, as is the case in every poet and original philosopher:—but

¹⁷ *Ib.*, p. 133-4.

¹⁸ *Ib.*, p. 88.

¹⁹ *Ib.*, p. 162.

hope fully gratified, and yet the elementary basis of the passion remaining, becomes fear; and, indeed, the general, who must often feel, even though he may hide it from his own consciousness, how large a share chance had in his successes, may very naturally be irresolute in a new scene, where he knows that all will depend on his own act and election."²⁰

IV

The general principle of psychological compensation is suggested by Coleridge over and over again, when he tests Shakespeare's characters and finds them tragic characters because of a deficiency in one sphere accompanied by a corresponding proficiency in another. Sometimes he sees a cause and effect relationship between the deficiency and the proficiency, and sometimes mere coexistence. The principle is, naturally, most fully elaborated in his notes on the character of Hamlet.

"I believe the character of Hamlet may be traced to Shakespeare's deep and accurate science in mental philosophy. . . . In order to understand him, it is essential that we should reflect upon the constitution of our own minds. Man is distinguished from the brute animals in proportion as thought prevails over sense: but in the healthy processes of the mind, a balance is constantly maintained between the impressions from outward objects and the inward operations of the intellect:—for if there be an overbalance in the contemplative faculty, man thereby becomes the creature of mere meditation, and loses his natural power of action. Now one of Shakespeare's modes of creating character is, to conceive any one intellectual or moral faculty in morbid excess, and then to place himself, Shakespeare, thus mutilated or diseased, under given circumstances. In Hamlet he seems to have wished to exemplify the moral necessity of . . . an *equilibrium* between the real and the imaginary worlds. In Hamlet this balance is disturbed: his thoughts, and the images of his fancy, are far more vivid than his actual perceptions, and his very perceptions, instantly passing through the *medium* of his contemplations, acquire, as they pass, a form and a color not naturally their own. Hence we see a great, an almost enormous, intellectual activity, and a proportionate aversion to real action, consequent upon it. . . . This character Shakespeare places in circumstances, under which it is obliged to act on the spur of the moment:—Hamlet is brave and careless of death; but he vacillates from sensibility, and procrastinates from thought, and loses the power of action in the energy of resolve."²¹

The same inverse ratio Coleridge finds exemplified in Richard II, with his "continually increasing energy of thought, and as

²⁰ *Ib.*, p. 165-6.

²¹ *Ib.*, p. 145.

constantly diminishing power of acting," and again, his "wordy courage which only serves to betray more clearly his internal impotence." ²²

Macbeth, similarly, he finds to be "all-powerful without strength; he wishes the end, but is irresolute as to the means." ²³

And finally:

"Lady Macbeth, like all in Shakspeare, is a class individualized:—of high rank, left much alone, and feeding herself with day-dreams of ambition, she mistakes the courage of fantasy for the power of bearing the consequences of the realities of guilt. Hers is the mock fortitude of a mind deluded by ambition; she shames her husband with a superhuman audacity of fancy which she can not support, but sinks in the season of remorse, and dies in suicidal agony." ²⁴

* * *

In a recent article on Coleridge as a philologist,²⁵ Professor J. H. Hanford notes that Coleridge's characteristic weaknesses show in his work as commentator as well as elsewhere, that his textual interpretations of Shakespeare were sometimes rendered inaccurate by his philosophical interests. The same might well be said of his character analyses as such. Some of his attempts to make manifest Shakespeare's fidelity to the laws of human nature are obvious struggles to construe facts in terms of theory, and are of dubious value. In any estimate of Coleridge's psychological genius this must be granted.

Moreover, this compilation of notes that seem to have some integrating principle is in no sense evidence of any original formulation of a well defined standpoint. An attempt to get at the origins of the psychological comments quoted would lead one far and wide over the field of recognized sources of Coleridge's philosophic thought. The ideas involved could doubtless be traced back in every case to Aristotle or Leibnitz or Kant, or one or more of a dozen others that should be named. And there is little evidence that Coleridge consciously worked out the relationships involved. Granted all this, however, the notes that have been compiled seem to be significant anticipations, and go far toward justifying the eclecticism from which they result.

Vassar College.

ALICE D. SNYDER.

²² *Ib.*, pp. 125 and 126-7.

²³ *Ib.*, p. 168.

²⁴ *Ib.*, p. 170.

²⁵ *Modern Philology*. April, 1919.

RUNAWAYS' EYES AGAIN

Spread thy close curtain, love-performing night,
That runaways' eyes may wink, and Romeo
Leap to these arms, untalk'd of and unseen!

(*Romeo and Juliet*, III, ii, 5.)

Perhaps no apology is needed for venturing to speculate once more upon this notorious crux. In the Yale edition (1917) Professor W. H. Durham says:

"The present editor is inclined to believe that, unless the text is hopelessly corrupt, the runaways are the horses of the sun referred to above, so that the wish that they may close their eyes in sleep is another way of wishing for the coming of darkness. Among the many other readings and explanations which have been offered, perhaps the most plausible is that of Stewart, who would read 'runaway's,' and who believes the runaway to be Juliet herself, who is running away from her maiden modesty."

This last idea Stewart bases on the general situation of Juliet, and quotes *Hen. V.*, (v, ii, 327):

Burg. Can you blame her then, being a maid yet rosed over with the virgin crimson of modesty, if she deny the appearance of a naked blind boy in her naked seeing self? It were, my lord, a hard condition for a maid to consign to.

K. Hen. Yet they do wink and yield, as love is blind and enforces.

Mr. Stewart also cites *All's Well*, iv, ii, 39, where Diana says "we'll forsake ourselves," that is, forsake maidenhood. Mr. Stewart insists that the phrase *runaway's eyes* is figurative:

"To regard her as a runaway merely because she went secretly to Friar Lawrence to be married proves equally futile when put to the test. For we are still left with the problem of finding out how or why, in that sense of running away, she should wish her eyes to close or wink? . . . Even the poorest of critics, with a few exceptions, have seen that the solution here is not to come from a very literal point of view. Whatever Shakespeare's meaning may be, the word has some figurative application which is more illuminating."¹

If for the moment we accept the singular form *runaway's*, it

¹ C. D. Stewart, *Textual Difficulties in Shakespeare*, 1914, p. 7.

makes no difference whatever (except as one prefers one or the other view) whether the word is taken literally or in Mr. Stewart's figurative sense, because in either case Juliet, looking forward to the consummation of marriage with mingled eagerness and maiden modesty, would wish for darkness to shroud her, and for the sense of darkness she would obtain by shutting her eyes—so that this particular 'problem' of the critic does not exist.

But it is much more natural to read the plural *runaways*, for the minor reasons that the singular without either article is impossibly strained and awkward in style, and, in Mr. Stewart's or any other interpretation, more or less far-fetched. The chief reasons are more positive. As even the poorest critics have recognized. Romeo and Juliet have both run away from their respective families to be secretly married, and Juliet is now awaiting the secret visit of her husband—what could be more natural than for her to speak of herself *and* Romeo as runaways? If this is not a runaway marriage, what is the play about?

It may be asked why, if *runaways* refer to herself and Romeo, Juliet should wish that they shut their eyes. In the circumstances it is the most natural wish in the world. Juliet is a very young and modest bride, just married, secretly and in defiance of her family, to a young man whom she loves, but has barely seen. Even long familiarity between lovers does not mitigate the first sense of strangeness after marriage, and in this case there has been no familiarity. Romeo comes as a husband, it is true, but also as a stranger. Inevitably, then, Juliet feels even more than the ordinary bride's timidity, and she not only welcomes the enveloping darkness, but desires that both she and Romeo may close their eyes, in order that the ordeal may be less trying for her. She thinks of night in several ways—it will bring her lover, it will hide her from his sight and him from her's, and it will prevent other people from knowing of his visit. Her unusual situation and her sensitiveness cause her to heap up in rapid succession her desires for every possible means of obtaining real or fancied secrecy. Hence darkness is not enough. She wishes to be hidden from outsiders ("untalk'd of and unseen"), but mainly from herself and from Romeo; for the moment she considers both herself and Romeo as belonging to the world from which she desires to hide, and if both close their eyes, neither will, as it were, be a witness of the offence done to her modesty.

Further, this interpretation is the only one that really explains the following lines,

Lovers can see to do their amorous rites
By their own beauties . . .

"Which is to say," says Stewart, in support of his own view, "without eyes or the help of light." If both Romeo and Juliet are to have their eyes shut, these lines become intelligible.

Such a view is also supported by a Shakespearean passage which has not, I think, been cited in this connection, though it constitutes a parallel of striking exactness.

Art thou asham'd to kiss? Then wink again,
And I will wink; so shall the day seem night;
Love keeps his revels where there are but twain.
Be hold to play, our sport is not in sight. . . .

(*Venus and Adonis*, 121 ff.)

It is a far cry from the wanton Venus to the chaste Juliet, but in the poem and the play the situations are precisely the same. In each case the speaker is trying to persuade a person of maiden modesty (in the one, Adonis, in the other, the speaker's self) that the performance of love's rites may be achieved with the minimum of offence to that modesty if both create a double night by shutting their eyes.

DOUGLAS BUSH.

Harvard University.

REVIEWS

Pierre de Nolhac, *Ronsard et l'humanisme*, Paris, Champion, 1921.
Pp. xi, 365.

About ten years ago¹ the writer of these lines expressed regret that the author of a well-known and much used bibliographical manual seemed to ignore the value of the contribution of the Latinists of the 16th century to the development of the French Renaissance. Since that date, with the sole exception of the few

¹Review of Lanson's *Manuel bibliographique du 16e siècle* in the *Romanic Review*, I, 1910, pp. 98-100.

scholarly editions² of the works of the Latinizing poets of this epoch, little has been done to acquaint us with the extent and importance of this rich literature. And yet, notwithstanding this inexplicable attitude of indifference on the part of most scholars, M. de Nolhac has well said:

"La Pléiade, à ses débuts, fut entourée d'un monde latinisant, qui vivait sur le fonds qu'elle exploitera elle-même et puisait sa vigueur aux mêmes sources. . . . La prose latine du même temps, si riche en tous les genres et dont l'esprit français fit alors si noble usage, ne le préparait-elle pas de la même façon à goûter les *Essais* et à en assurer la diffusion?"³

In one of the first pages of this stimulating work there is found furthermore a succinct statement (p. 2) which, however, contains a fact of such capital importance that it deserves our immediate attention,—“cette émulation (with the Italians) n'existe pas moins dans l'usage de la langue internationale.” In other words, just as Calvin polished and repolished his style in the Latin edition of the *Institutions* because, to a large extent, his ill-concealed patriotism demanded that he, as a representative of France, should not be considered by the European public as in any way inferior to the scholarly humanists of Germany or the brilliant disciples of Bembo and Speroni in Italy, so the poets, actuated by similar patriotic motives, sought to prove to the same public their equality with the masters of antiquity. No, it is a mistaken idea—to which alas! we so firmly cling,—that they who wrote in Latin in this epoch were devoid of feeling for their native land.⁴ With how many false generalities is the history of literature permeated!

² Such as *Eclogues* of Baptista Mantuanus (1911), of Sannazaro (1914), of Andrelinus and Arnolletus (1918) issued by Professor W. P. Mustard of Johns Hopkins University, and a few other works. For a list of the principal collections of Latin verse from 1525 to 1549, cf. Chamard, *J. du Bellay*, p. 103. But, as M. de Nolhac notes (p. 5), the *Delitiae* contain the verses of 109 Latin poets born in France—a proof of their popularity.

³ Pp. viii-ix. Cf. also p. 3: “La grande production latine ne peut être négligée et parfois, comme chez Salmon Macrin ou Théodore de Bèze, révèle de véritables talents. Même lorsqu'a commencé avec Ronsard la magnifique rénovation du lyrisme français, on voit se répandre des recueils en latin toujours plus habiles et plus variés. Aussi les contemporains qualifiés prennent-ils tout à fait au sérieux cette poésie et lui conservent-ils son rang, à côté de sa sœur cadette.” And he cites Montaigne and Du Bellay in support of this statement (11, 17).

⁴ Furthermore such ardent defenders of French as Du Bellay, Baïf,

The present volume was originally intended to form a part of a vast *Histoire de l'Humanisme en France*, which the brilliant author outlined some forty years ago, and to which the late René Sturel was bringing to bear the youthful enthusiasm of his careful scholarship at the time when he made, with characteristic self-abnegation, the supreme sacrifice in behalf of his country. Truly in him was revived the patriotic spirit of the Renaissance to which his life work was devoted!⁵

M. de Nolhac, who was recently elected to the Académie Française, represents in the highest sense the happy combination of the scholarly and the artistic. His power of evoking the whole tableau of the epoch with which he deals, his beautiful imagery, refinement of expression, a style so deftly polished that one is not aware of the effort it cost—in a word, this “séduction de la forme,” to use the words the author applies to the “prince of poets,” is especially fitting in a work devoted to the Renaissance. Indeed, his prose challenges comparison with Walter Pater or even Renan. And back of this outward charm is a solid and broad erudition which, though the minutest detail is not overlooked, never obtrudes itself into the picture. Only here and there does his enthusiasm for his subject—so characteristic of the sixteenth century—get the better of his subtle restraint. When, for example, he states that Ronsard “a renouvelé de fond en comble la matière et la forme, l'inspiration et le vocabulaire de notre poésie” (p. 6), we wonder whether he really meant to introduce the phrase “de fond en comble.” Again the relations of the page Ronsard with the distinguished ambassador Lazare de Baïf and the rôle of this unknown youth at the conference of Haguenau (p. 12) is no doubt authentic in every respect, but the picture drawn by the author is so very beautiful that one cannot but wish for more documentary evidence.⁶

Belleau, the distinguished statesman Michel de l'Hospital, and the learned critic, Etienne Pasquier, whom M. de Nolhac characterizes as “le grand défenseur du français,” took pride in their pleasing Latin verses.

⁵Thanks to the liberality of Mr. Edward Tuck, the Sturel library will serve as an inspiration to future students of French literature in Dartmouth College.

⁶The following typographical errors have been noted—surprisingly few, be it said, for a work requiring so much care: P. 5, note 1: ‘Jahrunderts’ for ‘Jahrhunderts’; p. 30, note 4; ‘1899-99’ for ‘1898-99’; p. 42: ‘note 3, note 4’ should be ‘note 4, note 3’; p. 44, line 11: ‘ces’ for ‘ces’; p. 50,

II.

The first part of this monumental work is devoted to the education and reading of Ronsard wherein M. de Nolhac does not minimize, as many of his predecessors have done, the influence of the most human of all classical poets, Horace—to whom Ronsard turned with fervor when surfeited with his Greek erudition—and the indebtedness of the prince of poets to the advice and counsel of his contemporary, that very versatile genius, Jacques Peletier du Mans, who was later destined to compose the *Art poétique* of the *Pléiade*. That it was in Homer that Ronsard acquired “la sagesse antique, les grandes leçons morales de l’humanité présentées sous le voile allégorique” (p. 70) is no doubt true, but in doing so the poet was only adhering to the medieval tradition yet ensconced in the very beings of the most radical of his contemporaries. And again when employing his involved periphrases and symbolistic allusions, as so brilliantly presented by M. de Nolhac (p. 92), was not Ronsard a more docile disciple of the incomprehensible Maurice Scève⁷ than has heretofore been admitted? The rôle of this interesting person, whose erudition was the delight of the élite, is yet to be satisfactorily studied. But after all, such lacunae seem only trivial when one considers the vast range of the investigations of M. de Nolhac as shown in this section of his work.

The second part, dealing with the relations of Ronsard and the humanists of his time, is a model of its kind in that it reveals a critical equipment and sense of values possessed by few scholars. It is only at rare intervals that one notes even errors of detail. And in those instances most often M. de Nolhac is not himself at fault—it is rather the source from which his data have been drawn.⁸

note 1: ‘duchesse of Savoy’ for ‘Duchess of Savoy’; p. 55, l. 10: ‘Ies’ for ‘les’; p. 103, note 2: ‘W. P. Mustard *Piscatory Eglogues*’ for ‘*Ecloques*’; p. 143, note 3: ‘1653’ for ‘1563’; p. 205, VII, p. 211, IX (there is no sect. VIII); p. 282, note 2: ‘nomm’ for ‘nommé’; p. 283: ‘sudes’ for ‘sur des’; ‘quelques’ for ‘quelques’; p. 302, note 1: ‘gagetez’ for ‘gayetez.’

⁷ For Scève, the reader may be referred to Baur, *M. S.* (Paris, 1906), reviewed by myself in the pages of this review (1908, pp. 229-231), as well as my article on *The Family of M. S.* in *PMLA.*, 1909, pp. 470-475.

⁸ For example, on p. 145, note 5, following P. Hume Brown (*George Buchanan Humanist and Reformer*, Edinburgh, 1890), he states that Jean

What a varied group they form, these friends and acquaintances of Ronsard! George Buchanan, the Scottish poet, reformer and humanist; Antonio de Gouvea, the famous Portuguese jurist; Turnèbe, professor of Greek; Lambin, the translator; Jean de Morel, the bibliophile; Michel de l'Hospital, chancellor of France; Etienne Forcadet,⁹ the jurist of Béziers whom Brantôme called

de Morel "fut, en France et en Piémont, précepteur de Timoléon de Cossé, fils de Charles de Cossé-Brissac, jusqu'en 1560." Now Abbé Jugé has shown (*Jacques Peletier du Mans, 1517-1582*, Paris, 1907) that toward the close of the year 1553 Peletier entered the service of the Marshal as the preceptor of his ten-year-old son, and as a consequence published the following year (1554) his manual entitled *Enseignement de vertu au petit seigneur Timoléon de Cossé*. It is probable that the poet-mathematician continued to fill this position until his return to Paris at the end of 1557.

⁹ As M. de Nolhac states (p. 191) that there is only a brief and insufficient modern study on Forcadet, (that of A. de Faniez in the *Bull. de la Soc. hist. de Béziers*, t. xiv, 1889) the following addenda to his data on this personage may be of interest: While Forcadet's biographers (La Croix du Maine, I, 182; Du Verdier, I, 495; Goujet, XI, 423-430; and others) accept without hesitation the traditional date of his death (1573), he was still alive in 1585, as shown by a document in the archives of Béziers, dated July 12, 1585. Cf. communication of M. Soucaille in *Revue des Sociétés savantes*, VIIe série, I (1879), p. 123; in 1542 he published his *Penus juris civilis ad rem alimentariam*, Lyons, M. Parmenterius, 4to, Library of Bordeaux, *Jur.* *702a (10201); besides the edition of the *Chant des Seraines* (Corrozet, Paris, 1548) noted by M. Laumonier (*Ronsard*, pp. xliii, 664) two other editions appeared the same year, one by Arnoul l'Angelier, Paris, 16mo (Catalogue Techener, May, 1889) and the other by Jean de Tournes, Lyons, 8vo, 120 pp. (Cat. Rothschild, VI); in 1549 appeared his *Necyomantia jurisperiti, sive de occulta jurisprudentia Dialogi*, Lyons, de Tournes, 4to, Library of Bordeaux, *Jur.* 578 (10236); 1550, a second edition of his *Penus juris civilis, sive de alimentis Tractatus*, etc., Lyons, de Tournes, 4to, Library of Bordeaux, *Jur.* 702b (10264); 1553, his *Cupido Iurisperitus*, Lyons, de Tournes, 4to; 1556, *Oratio Stephani Forcatuli, publici in academia Tolosana legum professoris, ex offic. Jac. Colomerii*, Toulouse; his *Lectiones aliquot juris*, given at Toulouse from 1561 to 1563, are in Ms. 204 of the Library of Carpentras (Lambert I, p. 112); in 1571 (and again in 1574) appeared his *Montmorency Gaulois, Opuscule dédié à Monsieur d'Anville, Mareschal de France, Visroy en plusieurs Provinces: ou l'excellence de son origine, et autres gestes des François par Forcadet Iuriscons.*, 4to, 29 pp., Library of Berne, W. 5, 7e pièce; on fol. 2 vo. of which are Latin epigrams by the author; about 1575 he composed his *Ad legem fructus percipiendo de usu* which remains unpublished in Ms. 227 of the Library of Carpentras; in 1579 (repeated in 1595, Geneva, Jacques Chouet, 8vo., Catalogue Lelong, no. 3790, and

"un grand poète latin"; Joseph Scaliger, the philologist; Jan Kochanowski, the Polish poet; Charles Utenhove,¹⁰ of Ghent, "le plus savant étranger qui fût alors en Paris," a most remarkable polyglot; Paul Melissus, the German savant and critic, according to whom no poets writing in the German tongue were worthy of

Library of Frankfort, *Gall. gen. Is.* 322) was published his *De Gallorum imperio et philosophia libri septem*, Paris, Guill. Chaudière, 4to, Catalogue Potier, 1872, no. 2283; the same year, 1579, according to the *Bibl. Sunderlandiana* (no. 4655) was issued his *Henrico III. Francorum et Poloniae regi relata Gratia, Primo libro continetur Valesiorum Franciae regum Origo splendida . . . secundo quod foeminae illustres regnis gubernandis . . . tertio ampliores gratias regi agens autor*, Paris, G. Chaudière, 8vo.; in 1580 appeared a second edition of the *De Gallorum Imperio* (see 1579), of which the catalogue Claudin (Dec. 1882, no. 50849) erroneously states that the author was his brother Pierre, the celebrated professor of mathematics at Paris, cf. *Bibl. Sunderlandiana*, no. 4656; he took part in a meeting of the Council of the city of Béziers, Nov. 26, 1591, cf. Seucaille, *Recherches sur les anciennes pestes ou contagions à Béziers*, 1884, p. 81; after his death his *Opera* were published by G. Chaudière, Paris, 1595, fol., *Bibl. Sunderlandiana*, nos. 4651, 4652; and in 1615 his *Opuscula varia*: I, *de servitutibus*, II, *de mora*, III, *de collatione bonorum*, IV, *de jure, autoritate et imperio regum Francorum*, Paris, R. Fouet, 4to., Library of Bordeaux, *Jur.* 703 (10265). Etienne had two brothers, François, "docteur en droictz et aduocat au siège de Béziers" who was massacred at B. in June 1604 (cf. *Rev. des Soc. Sav.*, VIIe sér., I, 1879, p. 125) and Pierre, mentioned above; and one son, Imbert, who died in 1551 (cf. *Poésie*, 1551, p. 167).

¹⁰ Re Charles Utenhove or Uytenhove, the following data may serve as a supplement to those supplied by M. de Nolhac (pp. 215-218 etc.): Born at Ghent in 1536, died at Cologne, Aug. 1, 1600, cf. La Croix du Maine, I, 119, Du Verdier, I, 310; contributed Latin verses at the end of the *Ravissement d'Orithye* of B. Tagault, 1558; also French sonnet and Latin distich in the *Epithalame sur le mariage de . . . Philibert Emanuel*, by Joachim du Bellay, 1558; was author of various Greek verses of Olimpia Morata translated into Latin (pp. 87, 95) and of a Latin poem of the same rendered into Greek (p. 100) in *Olimpiae Fulviae Moratae . . . Monumenta*, 1558; *Epitaphium in mortem Herrici* (sic) *Gallorum regis christianiss. eius nominis secundi*, by Carolum Utenhovium Gandavensum, et alios, *duodecim linguis. Epitaphe sur le trespas du Roy treschrestien Henry Roy de France, II de ce nom, en douze langues*, etc., Paris, *Imprim. de Robert Estienne*, 1560, 4to, half-parchment. This is the second work of U., *seigneur de Marckeghem*, very rare, cf. catalogue Uyt, Ghent, Dec., 1880; *κάρουλος Ούδεν ὁ Βίος*, distich at beginning of Jacques Grévin's *L'Olimpe*, 1560; sonnets addressed to him by Nicolas Ellain, 1561, cf. ed. Genty, 1861, pp. 24, 62; *Ad illustrem virum D. Robertum Dudlaeum a*

mention; Torquato Tasso; Castelvetro; Sperone Speroni—in brief, most of the leading figures of the world of scholarship and letters in Europe.

Well can M. de Nohac conclude (p. 243) after having given this broad as well as complete survey of the intellectual interests and relationships of Ronsard: "Toute notre poésie classique s'abreuve, après lui, aux sources antiques; mais il est le seul de nos grands poètes qui soit, au sens complet et au degré le plus éminent, un grand humaniste."

The third part of this interesting study is devoted to the Latin writings of Ronsard (pp. 244-270) which have neither been brought together nor been so carefully annotated heretofore; while the fourth and last part concerns the "Cicéronien de la Brigade," Pierre de Paschal, who, notwithstanding the extravagant eulogies of his many friends, was, like his Italian counterpart, Pietro Aretino, far more of an adventurer than a poet. After sketching the audacious career of this parvenu,¹¹ M. de Nohac develops his

regina Angliae comitem designatum ἐξάστυχον, and at the end Ἐξωτοῦ θεοῦ οὐδέν ὁ βίος, 1565, Library of the Univ. of Ghent, *album ms. de Jean Bademaker*, fol. 25; an anonymous poet dedicated to him in 1566 *Le Trophée de la parole divine victorieuse au Pays Bas*, to which U. added a satirical *huitain*. In this poem C. U. is only designated by his initials V. C., but he is more clearly indicated in the text. The copy in the Library of the University of Ghent contains an *envoi* in his hand; cf. *Recueil de chansons, poèmes et pièces en vers français, relatifs aux Pays-Bas, publié par les soins de la Société des Bibliophiles de Belgique*, III, 1878, pp. 161-168; May 2, 1574, he registered as a student in the University of Heidelberg at the same time as *Nicolaus uten Hove*, cf. Toepke, *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg*, II, 1886, p. 70; 1578, Gérard Marie d'Imbert dedicated to him one of his *sonnets exotériques*, no. 26, cf. the note of Tamizey de Larroque, p. 77; 1579-1581, Nicolas Reusner dedicated to him the 39th selection of Book III of the *Emblemata* in which U. is entitled patrician of Ghent, cf. ed. of 1581, p. 154. His son Jacques Uienhove of Ghent was registered at the Faculty of Medicine of Montpellier, Feb. 26, 1566, cf. J. E. and G. Planchon, *Guillaume Rondelet*, 1866, appendix 37; and another son, Charles, addressed, from Neuss, Aug. 31, 1580, a Latin epistle in verse to Nicolas Reusner, which is found on p. 365 of the *Emblemata* mentioned above; in 1602, the humanist Justus Lipsius addressed him an epistle which may be found in his *Epistolarum selectarum centuria miscellanea*, 1602. Charles U., Jr., died at Cologne in 1605.

¹¹ In his discussion of the relations between Paschal and Jean de Boysson or Boyssonné, the Toulousan jurist (p. 281 and notes), M. de Nohac

ingenious hypothesis (p. 325) that Paschal was the object of the much mooted satire, *La nouvelle manière de faire son profit des lettres*, published, with the *Poète courtisan*, in 1559, and which he attributes, following Clément¹² and M. Chamard,¹³ to an anonymous collaboration of the author of the latter poem, Du Bellay, and the Greek scholar Turnèbe.¹⁴ But notwithstanding the extensive erudition and cogent logic brought by M. de Nolhac to the support of his contentions, one is not only left unconvinced but feels that the ardor of the distinguished critic's enthusiasm for Ronsard has betrayed his better judgment. It is wholly inconceivable that some of the numerous ambitious friends of Paschal, who were equally jealous of the fame of the rising members of the *Pléiade*, did not inform him immediately thereof and prevent him from composing the beautiful epitaph of Du Bellay a few months later (1560). If, on the other hand, we accept the arguments of M. de Nolhac as well-founded, then all of the discredit falls on the *Docte Brigade*, for Paschal's attitude can only be characterized as one of dignified silence. No, Ronsard's and Pasquier's petulant and virulent invective can be easily explained by bitter disappointment at the astounding success of a rival whom they considered an inferior,¹⁵ and was shared apparently by none of their friends.

seems to have overlooked the following contributions in which the correspondence of the latter is more fully utilized than in the earlier biography of Guibal (1863) mentioned by him: Mugnier, *La Vie et les ouvrages de Jean de Boyssonné* (Paris, 1897); Buche, *La Correspondance de J. de B.*, *Rev. des Lang. rom.*, 1896 et seq.; and Gerig, *Deux Lettres inédites de J. de B.*, *Rev. de la Ren.*, VII, 1906, pp. 228-232.

¹² *De Adriani Turnebi regii professoris praelectionibus et poematis*, Paris, 1899, p. 9.

¹³ *Joachim du Bellay*, Lille, 1900, pp. 412-418.

¹⁴ One is therefore led to believe that M. de N. accepts M. Chamard's hypothesis that in the *Poète courtisan* du Bellay had also Paschal in mind. But this is very doubtful since this subject had been a somewhat commonplace poetic theme from the time Alain Chartier wrote his *Curial*.

¹⁵ For example, Pasquier states that Paschal "ne sçavoit parler ny latin, ny françois" (p. 261), yet M. de Nolhac finds his Latin prose superior to that of Ronsard (p. 294), and even remarks of the letter to Bohier (p. 308) that "la thèse cicéronienne est défendue dans un style qui veut joindre l'exemple à la théorie." Furthermore he admits (p. 313) that both Ronsard and Brantôme were unjust when the former asserted that Paschal "n'avait même commencé" his historical work and the latter that

Only a few years later (1563) Ronsard realized the unpleasant impression produced by his venomous outburst and sought a reconciliation with the unjustly assailed Paschal (p. 334). All of which goes to show that the work of M. de Nolhac would have benefited by the omission—or at least a change of the tone—of this chapter.

III.

According to Binet, the Boswell of Ronsard, the great poet was interred at St.-Côme.¹⁶ To this day, as in Estienne Pasquier's time (1607), there is still no "marque de tombeau." When the writer of these lines visited the ruins of the famous monastery in 1921, the tomb of the great poet could not be located because of the stable enclosing it! Alas, how unlike the wish expressed so fervently in the *ode de l'élection de son sépulchre* that it be sheltered by an

"Arbre qui soit couvert
Tousjours de vert.

.....
Et la vigne tortisse
Mon sépulchre embellisse,
Faisant de toutes pars
Un ombre espars."

May we not hope that the admirers

"D'un, de qui l'univers
Chante les vers"

will be able to effect a realization of the ardent longing expressed in this noble poem!

JOHN L. GERIG.

Columbia University.

he lived "dans la fourberie et amusoit le monde." Our critic is on firmer ground when he confesses (p. 298) that the kindness of Paschal "n'a laissé chez Ronsard aucun sentiment de reconnaissance." In fact, do we not have here the key to the very undignified attitude assumed by the great, but vain and ambitious, poet?

¹⁶ Paul Laumonier, *Vie de P. de R. de Claude Binet (1586)*, Paris, 1910, pp. 35, 186-187.

Goethe, Geschichte eines Menschen, von EMIL LUDWIG. Stuttgart, Cotta, 1920.

The reaction against the mass of Goethe research, which in spite of separate excellence was threatening to dissect Goethe into an infinite number of infinitesimal parts, of recent years attracted various unusual writers to the problem of reconstructing the entity of Germany's richest genius. In each case the result is good only in so far as the author has the power to create a synthesis and at the same time prove that he is in command of the bulk of analytical research.

Chamberlain shows a haughty disregard for much of the important research. Even his synthesis of the Goethe figure is not so much a piece of creative work as a laborious arrangement of Goethe phenomena under a system which is rather too ingenious.

Gundolf is much more thorough a scholar. There is no doubt that he commands the Goethe literature. He handles it smoothly and easily, but he too is a slave to the theory according to which he chooses to make his synthesis. His figure of Goethe in *Shakespeare und der deutsche Geist*, which also is based upon his *Urerlebnis* theory, is simple, plastic, and vivid. But in his *Goethe* (Georg Bondi, Berlin, 1918) this theory is so dogmatically and painstakingly expounded and so minutely applied that both simplicity and plasticity are lost.

Emil Ludwig is more modest and at the same time less restrained. He is a journalist and a novelist by profession. In treating historical characters he has at times been guilty of journalistic superficiality. However his *Bismarck* (Berlin, 1911) and his *Richard Dehmel* (Berlin, 1913) prove an unusual power of psychological analysis. His *Goethe, Geschichte eines Menschen* gives proof besides of real creative power and of very sound scholarship. He pictures the story of Goethe simply and intimately.

In his preface he claims to have neglected none of the philological research. Whether that is true or not, he soon proves beyond a doubt that he knows his character thoroughly, that he has lived with him from day to day, and has watched him closely whenever he expressed himself in his works, letters, diaries or conversations.

All writings of Goethe, even the works themselves, become merely means to see and portray the man himself. Whatever research is employed is used not for its own sake, but simply as a means.

The scholar is subordinated to the novelist. With all familiarity with Goethe, the importance of the work lies in the freedom and joy with which it is created. So Goethe remains eminently human; a genius, but a frail human being battling with the obstacles of every-day life that the tradition of "the young Apollo and the old Olympian" had made us forget. It is a book that must be read before and after a study of Goethe, but never can be used as a commentary simply. Perhaps it is really valuable only for those who are really familiar with Goethe already.

Ludwig relates the story of Goethe's development chronologically. He finds that it divides itself into twelve periods. As he makes a cross section of each period he finds a specific spiritual force predominating in it which becomes the title of a chapter. These he again groups under three larger forces: genius and the demoniac for the first volume, *Erdgeist* for the second, and tragic victory for the third. At frequent intervals a characteristic portrait is reproduced and skillfully made an integral part of the story. Each chapter is also begun with a very fine bit of local color as a setting for the period to be presented.

Ludwig begins his narrative with Goethe's appearance at Leipzig, since he finds so little first hand testimony of the early Frankfurt years. Because the autobiographical material deals with Goethe's boyhood in Frankfurt only in retrospect, it becomes descriptive of the manner of retrospection to the author more than of the boyhood itself. Delightfully new suggestions arise from this method.

Nothing can be gained by calling attention to old philological controversies in connection with Ludwig's book. Such a procedure would only make of the book that which it so pleasantly avoids: one more philological contribution. Its value lies wholly in the vividness with which a character is made to live and move, who has become a legendary figure all too cumberously laden during the last quarter century with controversies, researches and sentimentalities. It is not necessary to agree or disagree with Ludwig as one is almost constantly forced to do with Chamberlain or Gundolf. Ludwig takes Goethe off the dissecting table and makes him move again. You have a new familiarity with him and a new courage to come into contact with him and make up your mind about him anew.

The much discussed polarity of Goethe, the classical force of the severe genius at the one pole and the restless urge of the demoniac at the other, resolves itself into the human mystery of an unusual personality. Ludwig merely watches these forces meet and merge and then recede again; not schematically, but merely in the course of an attempt to keep a close watch on an unusual character as he moves and acts, or escapes from the consequences of his acts only to draw the clearer conclusions from them at a distance.

When Goethe writes Ludwig merely watches him trying to express himself, and gives no further discussion of the product than such a process carries with it. Often there are interesting side lights. Presenting Goethe at work on *Götz*, the author writes:

"But where has he seen a picture of this moral heroic *Adelheit*? A new characteristic of his writing: just as masculine and feminine elements mingle in him—and genius demands and almost assures such a mixture—so Goethe is to be found in his feminine characters no less, and often more, than in his men. Yes, at times it takes two women to picture the polarity of his own being with increased subtlety. Thus he reflects himself in *Adelheit* more than in *Götz*. In the pleasing didactic manner of his old age he later expresses this by saying, that in writing the play he had fallen in love with *Adelheit* until *Götz* crowded her out."

It is this kind of touch, or the picture Ludwig draws of Friederike of whom he makes an episode pure and simple until an old man recreates her in a mood of sentimental reminiscence, or the pathetic picture of Frau von Stein, or the tragic, all-too-human Christiane, or the careful and delightful reconstruction of Goethe's contact with Napoleon, but most of all the never ending battle of the opposites in Goethe himself, which make the book refreshing and suggestive. Decidedly the book is best just as it was evidently conceived by the author: not as a first introduction to Goethe but as a momentary suspension from controversies and as an attempt at an intimate lingering with the very human but very extraordinary man behind his work.

When Ludwig deduces, or rather sees, principles basic to Goethe's character, they are as simple as the method that leads him to find them. Speaking of Goethe's researches in science he says:

"Goethe's researches in every single case describe the same mystic cycle as his creative writing or his acts. The eyes see the opportunity, the genius perceives universals, the individual draws the conclusion. The lyric poet, minister, scientific investigator, constantly takes his course from observation through vision to law. It merely depends upon the extent of the difficulties of the matter at hand, whether the course takes minutes or years. Like in Leonardo and in Kepler the chance phenomenon rises to a vision and from the vision develops the form; 'for I had the same experience with these phenomena as with my poems: I did not make them but they made me.' Not different forms of perception set free the gifts in Goethe; it is the same soul which in the same very personal way projects itself upon events and phenomena. Haughtily like Faust he turns to the symbol of the macrocosm to feel himself a god, humbly like St. Francis he loses himself in his microcosm to feel God within himself."

The least that can be said of Ludwig's book, is that it is interesting and suggestive. The best that can be said for it, is that the author to a marked degree has fulfilled his purpose; slowly to unfold the landscapes of the soul of Goethe from youth to old age; to be accurate in every real sense, but vivid and plastic like a poet.

O. MANTHEY-ZORN.

Amherst College.

Minor Poets of the Caroline Period. Edited by George Saintsbury. Vol. III. Clarendon Press, 1921.

Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century. Edited, with an Essay, by H. J. C. Grierson, Clarendon Press, 1921.

"About the beginning of the seventeenth century, appeared a race of writers that may be called the metaphysical poets." This sentence, from Johnson's *Life of Cowley*, marks the beginning of a critical dispute which has raged intermittently ever since the *Lives of the Poets* was first published, in 1779. It was not written hastily (for Johnson told Boswell¹ that he considered the life of

¹ *Boswell*, II, 341 (Everyman edition). Boswell remarks that Johnson has "discovered to us, as it were, a new planet in the poetical hemisphere." If Johnson's use of "metaphysical" is puzzling, what shall we say of Boswell's use of "hemisphere"?

Cowley his best, on account of the description of the metaphysical poets), yet the very term by which Johnson introduced his discussion has been censured,² and the whole "metaphysical school" has lately been almost contemptuously waved aside by no less a student of Donne than Mr. Edmund Gosse,³ who says that critics have "mixed up such incongruous figures as Carew and Cowley in the sterility of a so-called and wholly supposititious 'Metaphysical School.'" These are very bitter words, and so far as they deprecate the term "metaphysical," very ineffectual ones. To abandon the designation at this late date would be merely confusing, for even before Johnson the term was current in the special sense in which Johnson used it.⁴

What was this special sense? So good a Johnsonian as Dr. Birbeck Hill confesses⁵ to a little difficulty at this point. And perhaps the real question is, rather, what the term was understood to mean—irrespective of Johnson's intention—and what it means today. Here a dilemma confronts us, for the term is used very vaguely. Does it mean "introspective," "psychological"? Yes, though probably that was not just what Johnson meant. Does it mean "far-fetched"? Yes again, that above all, but . . . the truth is that from Johnson down critics have used the term "metaphysical" loosely to mean "involved (whether in thought or in phrasing) and showing the influence of John Donne," without much attempt to isolate and define that influence.

² *E. g.*, by Southey, and later by Professor Courthope. More recently still Professor Edward Bliss Reed has said (*English Lyrical Poetry*, p. 241) "Dr. Johnson was . . . misleading when he applied the term 'metaphysical' to this trait of Donne's mind." (*i. e.*, ability to detect curious analogies.)

³ *London Times*, Oct. 12, 1919.

⁴ As is satisfactorily shown by A. H. Nethercot in *Modern Language Notes* for January, 1922. Grierson had already pointed out the same fact in the introduction to his edition of Donne (ii. viii), but Mr. Nethercot has added some significant quotations. His article and the introduction to Grierson's Donne should be read together. (*The Poems of John Donne. Edited from the old editions and numerous manuscripts, with introductions and commentary.* By Herbert J. C. Grierson, ii. vol. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1912.) The prefatory essay in this is the best essay I know on Donne, and the introduction to Professor Grierson's new volume is the best essay on the metaphysical poets in general.

⁵ In his edition of *Lives of the Poets*, I, 67.

Thomas Warton, writing six years after the publication of Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*, speaks ⁶ of Cowley's "metaphysical conceits, all the unnatural extravagances of his English poetry." This is not so enlightening as it might appear at first sight. If "unnatural extravagance" is the badge of metaphysical poetry, how are we to distinguish it from Euphuism? from sentimentalism? from symbolism? for all of these fashions in poetry exhibit "unnatural extravagance" in one form or another. Again, when Professor Saintsbury declares ⁷ all of Dryden's poetry to be metaphysical, on the ground that from first to last "he is the servant of misguiding or rightly guiding fantasy," where in the world of criticism are we? The implication seems to be that fantasy is fantasy, whether "misguiding" or "rightly guiding," and that fantastic poetry is metaphysical poetry. It is not likely that Professor Saintsbury would accept this interpretation of his dictum, but what other sense can his words bear? Professor Courthope ⁸ after calling Crashaw "a typical poet of the metaphysical school," proceeds to accept Pope's description ⁹ of that poet, as follows, "Only pretty conceptions, fine metaphors, glittering expressions,¹⁰ and something of a neat cast of verse"—words which only a superficial critic would apply to Cowley, and which none, I hope, would apply to Donne. Now if this is what it is to be "a typical poet of the metaphysical school," what becomes of Dr. Johnson's account? And is the school any longer the school of Donne? A final instance of critical carelessness may be allowed to show in what fluid state discussion of our school subsists even today. Miss Eloise Robinson, in her recent edition of the minor poems of Joseph Beaumont,¹¹ says, "What most surely . . . marks Beaumont as belonging to the school of Donne is the religious temper of his poetry." And she assigns Traherne to the same school for the same reason. Plainly, redefinition is necessary.

Ample material for a reëxamination of the whole question may

⁶ *Milton's Poems*, p. xv.

⁷ *Caroline Poets*, I, xiii.

⁸ *Pope's Works*, ed. Elwin-Courthope, v, 63.

⁹ *Ibid.* (Cites Pope's letter to Cromwell, Dec. 17, 1710.

¹⁰ Cf. Johnson's emphatic statement that the metaphysical poets were "careless of their diction."

¹¹ *The Minor Poems of Joseph Beaumont, D. D.*, p. xxx.

be conveniently found—and that for the first time—in two volumes which have just appeared, Professor Grierson's *Metaphysical Lyrics of the Seventeenth Century*, and Professor Saintsbury's *Caroline Poets*, Vol. III. It is worth noting at the outset that neither editor shows the slightest disposition to reject the term "metaphysical"; Professor Grierson defends it, and Professor Saintsbury uses it without apology, as a matter of course.¹² But their anthologies are quite different in purpose. Professor Grierson has tried to make a true anthology—to choose, that is, only the flower, the quintessence of metaphysical poetry; Professor Saintsbury, on the other hand, has sought to present¹³ "a corpus of 'metaphysical' poetry of the less easily accessible class." In these two volumes, then, we find the best and the worst, Donne and Cleveland, the wheat and the chaff, the apotheosis and the *reductio ad absurdum*.

Yet so sharp an antithesis does injustice to Professor Saintsbury's volume. It overlooks, for instance, the fact that one important name figures in both his list and Professor Grierson's. That is the name of Henry King. I have elsewhere¹⁴ maintained that King, and not Cowley,¹⁵ should be regarded as the true inheritor of Donne's poetic mantle, so far as it had an inheritor; and no doubt King would have been so regarded long since, if better known. Hannah's edition¹⁶ of his poems has long been out of print, and the edition of Professor Lawrence Mason, published in 1914, though favorably known to scholars, did not have the fortune to appear on the crest of the present interest¹⁷ in Donne.

¹² In an unpublished dissertation (in Harvard College Library) I have followed a similar course even to my choice of title. (*The Metaphysical Poets: John Donne and his School*.)

¹³ *Caroline Poets*, III, 4.

¹⁴ In the unpublished dissertation already referred to.

¹⁵ v. Johnson's *Life of Cowley*.

¹⁶ London, 1843.

¹⁷ Professor W. L. Phelps says that this interest is now wider than at any time since the mid-seventeenth century (v. his *The Advance of English Poetry in the Twentieth Century*. London, Geo. Allen & Unwin, 1920). Note also, as illustrating the interest in Donne and his influence, the appearance in 1919 of Mr. H. J. Massingham's delightful *Treasury of Seventeenth Century English Verse* (in Macmillan's Golden Treasury Series), Mr. Gregory Smith's *Ben Jonson* (in the English Men of Letters series), and Mr. Pearsall Smith's *Donne's Sermons: Selected Passages, with an Essay* (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press).

The first remark to make about the inclusion of King in these two anthologies is that the most famous of the poems ascribed to him—"Tell me no more how fair she is"—, though printed both by Grierson and by Saintsbury, is questioned by both. Grierson says merely,¹⁸ "This may not be King's, but there is no good reason for disfranchising him." Saintsbury includes it apparently on the sound principle that one should not surprise the reader.¹⁹ He says, however,²⁰ "it may be frankly and at once admitted that [King] has nothing exactly to match it." Hannah did not include the poem in his 1843 edition. Mr. Massingham printed it in his *Golden Treasury* anthology of seventeenth century lyrics, but said,²¹ "it is true neither to King's manner nor his mood, and suggests him only in its calm excellence of form." I do not think the poem is King's, but I rejoice that all three of these contemporary editors have continued to print it; the exclusion would be a thought too nice. But is "calm excellence of form" a trait of King's? In general, no doubt it is. Saintsbury speaks²² of King's "good taste, freedom from mawkishness, melody, and enough poetical essence" to escape mediocrity, and says of an Alexandrine intruded in one poem,²³ "An irregular line is so very rare in King that one suspects an error." Elsewhere he makes a very amusing and characteristic defence²⁴ of the following ill rhyme:

Whilst dull to write, and to do more unmeet,
I, as the night invites me, fall asleep.

But rhyme is a detail. If "calm excellence of form," "freedom from mawkishness," and "melody" were King's only qualities, I should not call him a son of John Donne, and I do not believe that Grierson and Saintsbury would have admitted him to the ranks of the "metaphysicals." He combined these qualities with fantasy and with power; though the power is less than Donne's, it is of the same kind. It is shown better than anywhere else in

¹⁸ P. 226.

¹⁹ Anatole France, *L'Île des Pingouins*, p. iv. "Le lecteur n'aime pas à être surpris."

²⁰ P. 164. Cf. the note on p. 273.

²¹ P. 183, note.

²² P. 383.

²³ P. 204, note.

²⁴ P. 179. "This outrageous assonance may have been meant in character—the poet being too much 'in the arms of Porpus' to notice it."

King's most famous long poem, *The Exequy*. Though this has passages that are weak through affectation, surely Grierson and Saintsbury are right in giving the entire poem, and Quiller-Couch was wrong when in the Oxford Book he omitted (for instance) the following lines, among others:

[I languish out, not live, the day]²⁵
 Using no other exercise
 But what I practice with mine eyes:
 By which wet glasses I find out
 How lazily time creeps about
 To one that mourns: this, onely this
 My exercise and business is:
 So I compute the weary houres
 With sighs dissolved into showres.
 Nor wonder if my time go thus
 Backward and most preposterous.

To say that this is unnatural is to claim over-much knowledge of the poet's mind. It may have been, it probably was, quite natural²⁶ to him. King was steeped in the poetry of Donne, and Donne's influence is almost omnipresent in King's poetry.²⁷ This can not be proved, for the reason that King is not a plagiarist,²⁸ but a poet. Collecting parallel passages is an amusing game, but a dangerous one too. Those who are ill acquainted with Donne must take my statements on faith, if they will; those who know him will hear the echo of his voice in many a stanza of King's. They will hear it in²⁹

"With this cast rag of my mortality
 Let all my faults and errors buried be.
 And as my cere-cloth rots, so may kind fate

²⁵ This line is in the Oxford Book. I quote it for context merely.

²⁶ Just as the classical allusions in *Lycidas* were natural to Milton. It is possible to consider *Lycidas* a frigid performance without accepting Johnson's implication that it is insincere.

²⁷ He was Donne's friend and the executor of his will, and he wrote a verse epitaph on him.

²⁸ Though there is justice in Saintsbury's remark (p. 180) that *The Surrender* and *The Legacy* "might as well be exercises in the school of King's great friend and master, Donne."

²⁹ *The Legacy*, Saintsbury, p. 181.

Those worst acts of my life incinerate.
 He shall in story fill a glorious room
 Whose ashes and whose sins sleep in one tomb."

They will hear it in ³⁰

"Go then, best soul, and, where you must appear,
 Restore the day to that dull hemisphere."

They will hear it again, harsh this time, but unmistakable, in such a line as ³¹

"Keep station, Nature, and rest, Heaven, sure. . . ."

King's lines are usually more mellifluous than this, but Jacobean mortuary poetry was often as deficient in music as in clarity.³²

It may be said, by the way, that a good essay on the elegies and eulogies of the seventeenth century is still wanting; possibly Professor Grierson or Professor Saintsbury will yet write it. Grierson notes in his introductory essay ³³ a verbal correspondence between Cleveland's poem on the death of Edward King and Milton's *Lycidas*; he might have added that in funeral collections of the period poet after poet echoed and reëchoed the same word, phrase, or conceit, until a given volume—or *tombeau*, as Saintsbury would call it—becomes a mere exercise-book.³⁴ But Saintsbury remarks, what Grierson also implies, that a comparison between Milton's poem and Cleveland's will bring out "the difference of ephemeral and eternal style in verse."

That Flatman and Whiting do not appear in Grierson's volume is understandable enough; I doubt if anyone (other than Professor Saintsbury and his printer) will nowadays read Flatman very carefully, though he did write one line ³⁵ famous enough to have been frequently misquoted. And Saintsbury himself admits ³⁶

³⁰ *The Departure. An Elegy.* Saintsbury, p. 204.

³¹ *An Elegy upon Prince Henry's Death.* Saintsbury, p. 216.

³² Jonson told Drummond that Donne "wrote that Epitaph on Prince Henry . . . to match Sir. Ed. Herbert in obscureness." (*Conversations*, VII.) MS. Harl. 3910 in the British Museum has a good version of Herbert's poem on the death of Prince Henry.

³³ P. lv.

³⁴ Cf. such a collection as *Jonsonus Virbius, or Lachrymae Musarum*, or the Edward King volume.

³⁵ Saintsbury, 392.

"But Princes . . .

Never submit to Fate, but only disappear."

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 282.

that Flatman is "imperfect, disappointing . . . only half anealed with the sacred unction." As for Whiting, there is certainly no sacred unction about him; he is curious in every sense, including that of the bookseller's catalogue. *The Pleasing History of Albino and Bellama* would have pleased Lord Byron in subject and style (in both it suggests *Don Juan*), and Mrs. Malaprop in its diction, of which Saintsbury remarks,³⁷ "He [Whiting] would almost be worth republishing for this alone." The propriety of this observation becomes evident when we consider such Whitingisms as *indod*, *trutinate*, *priorist*, *blough*, *phrentezy*, *goddy*, *vowel-plasters*, *satonisco*—but perhaps this is enough to explain Saintsbury's note on *bean-manors*,³⁸ "This makes excellent sense, but is not, perhaps, on that account more likely here." He is unfair, however, when he says of another line, "I have kept *ante* because I do not know whether it is for *aunt* or *ant*. Neither seems to give much sense." A glance at the context will show that "the ante" means simply "the former"; perhaps Saintsbury distrusted this as being too perspicuous for Whiting.

Such puzzles are rarer in Grierson's volume, for here we are dealing with the greater metaphysical manner, not the less. The difficulties are of a nobler sort. The finest of all metaphysical poems, Donne's *Ecstasy*, is here—what seventeenth-century singer did not know it and study its Platonism of love?—and a few pages further is the best³⁹ of the many imitations of it, Lord Herbert of Cherbury's⁴⁰ *Ode upon a Question moved, whether Love should continue forever?* A close comparison of these two poems is an object lesson in metaphysical poetry; the rules of rhetoric seem reversed, and that type of writing most forceful which is least clear. Thus, Donne's

But as all severall soules containe
Mixture of things, they know not what,
Love, these mixt soules, doth mixe againe,
And makes both one, each this and that

becomes in Herbert's hands

So when from hence we shall be gone,
And be no more, nor you, nor I,
As one another's mystery,
Each shall be both, yet both but one.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 442.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 450.

³⁹ Grierson, p. xxxvi.

⁴⁰ Grierson, p. 28.

What has happened? a gain in clearness, unquestionably, but—something is wanting. Yet both Donne and Lord Herbert of Cherbury are metaphysicals. So are any and all of their contemporaries who show themselves to be subtle, novel, and fantastic, and at the same time “subjective,” introspective, and unnatural. Whether they are “naturalist,” whether they are religious, whether (like Lord Herbert in his anticipation of the *In Memoriam* metre) they are metrically smooth—all these are minor questions. But finally, to quote again from Dr. Johnson’s *Life of Cowley*, “Critical remarks are not easily understood without examples”; and all the critical remarks which have ever been made about the metaphysical poets can now be adequately tested by any one who will first read diligently these two excellent selections.

Both books are admirable in format, but that goes without saying of Clarendon Press books. Professor Grierson’s is uniform with Mr. Pearsall Smith’s selection from Donne’s sermons.

BEN C. CLOUGH.

Brown University.

CORRESPONDENCE

AN ENGLISH IMITATOR OF FAVART: ISAAC BICKERSTAFFE

The *Sultan or a Peep into the Seraglio*, a farce in two acts, was staged with success at Drury Lane on December 12, 1775, and soon became a favorite play of the more provincial repertory at Dublin and at Edinburgh.¹ The author, Isaac Bickerstaffe, who must be distinguished from the actor of the same name,² wrote the play in France, for, three years before its first representation, he had been forced to cross the Channel on account of a scandalous affair on which historians insist but little.³ He stayed in France for a long time, possibly for twenty or more years. It is worthy of note that *The Sultan* is but a paraphrase, in several scenes almost a literal translation, of a well-known French Vaudeville, the *Trois Sultanes*

¹ Cf. *A Collection of the most esteemed Farces and Entertainments*. Edinburgh, 1792, Vol. I; J. Knight, *David Garrick*, 1894, p. 261.

² On Bickerstaffe, the actor, see Genest’s *Some account of the English Stage*. . . . Vol. II and III. Isaac Bickerstaffe is also the pseudonym of Steele and Addison.

³ On Isaac Bickerstaffe, the playwright, see: *Dict. of Nat. Biogr.* Articles “Bickerstaffe” and “Dibdin”; *Biographia Dramatica*, 1912; J. Knight, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

by Favart (1761). It is not difficult to guess how Bickerstaffe became acquainted with the French Play. He had been for several years the literary factotum of Garrick, who, in his turn, was a close friend of Favart and had an extensive correspondence with him.⁴ Moreover, Bickerstaffe, living in France, must have been aware of the lasting success of the *Trois Sultanes* at Paris, where it is sometimes staged even now.⁵

It seems astonishing that this imitation, which amounts in certain scenes almost to plagiarism, was not discovered at the time. Garrick may not have been ignorant of it, for he knew Favart and his works. His silence can be explained by the fact that Bickerstaffe was, at that time, very unhappy and in great need of financial help. Bickerstaffe's letter to him of June 22, 1772, which implores his help and forgiveness, has rightly been called "one of the saddest of human documents."⁶ Garrick may have desired to help him by staging his adaptation of the *Trois Sultanes*, notwithstanding its lack of originality. On the other hand, it is also possible that Garrick was entirely indifferent to the source of a play as long as it was a success with the public.

It has been suggested that Bickerstaffe's play is based upon Favart's source,⁷ the story of *Soliman II*, one of Marmontel's *Contes Moraux*, of which two English versions had appeared, in 1764 and in 1768. But, since *The Sultan* contains a number of changes which Favart made when he adapted the prose story to the stage, and since a number of lines are found in it in which the very words of Favart are reproduced, it is clear that Bickerstaffe did not make use of Marmontel's story. A few examples will be sufficient to substantiate this: Favart introduced into the *Trois Sultanes* such changes as were demanded by theatrical effectiveness. He gave, for instance, to the Sultan a picturesque Turkish pipe, of which no trace is found in Marmontel's text. This detail, which must have added a note of caricature to the gallant Sultan's conduct, has been faithfully reproduced by Bickerstaffe, as well as Favart's scene in which Soliman invites Roxelane to smoke with him. She throws the pipe away, to the great delight of the theater-goers. Bickerstaffe has taken this scene over. The scene of the banquet in *The Sultan* is copied from scene XII of Act III of the *Trois Sultanes*. Favart introduced into his play an "écuyer tranchant," who does not appear in Marmontel's story. He is found, too, in Bickerstaffe's imitation. In a word, in almost every

⁴ Cf. Franck Hedgcock, *David Garrick and His French Friends*, pp. 363 and 294; Favart, *Mémoires et Correspondance*, 1808.

⁵ Acted in Paris as late as 1910.

⁶ *Dict. of Nat. Biog. Art.* "Bickerstaffe" and J. Knight, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

⁷ Cf. Max Freund, *Die moralischen Erzählungen Marmontels*, 1905, p. 73; Martha P. Conant, *The Oriental Tale in England in the Eighteenth Century*, 1908, p. 204.

respect in which Favart's play differs from its source, Bickerstaffe has imitated it. The reason for it is easily found: Favart's sense of which scenes would please the audience was finely developed and Bickerstaffe was desirous of following in the wake of his success.

As examples of Bickerstaffe's translation, I cite the following lines from the two plays:

Va dire à ton Sultan, réplique cette belle,
Que je ne prends point de sorbet*
Et que mes pieds n'ont point de poussière.

Go tell your master, I have no dust on my feet, and that I don't like Sherbet.

Au lieu d'avoir pour émissaire
Ce prétendu monsieur que je ne puis souffrir,
Prenez un officier, jeune, bien fait, aimable,
Qui vienne les matins consulter nos désirs,
Et nous faire un plan agréable
De jeux, de fêtes et de plaisirs.
Pourquoi de cent barreaux vos fenêtres couvertes?
C'est de fleurs qu'il faut les garnir!
Et que le bonheur seul empêche d'en sortir. . . .

Bickerstaffe here has changed the order of his translation, but he remains close to Favart's text:

Let your window-bars be taken down. Let the doors of the Seraglio be thrown open. Let inclination alone keep your women within it; and instead of that ugly odious creature there, send a handsome, smart, young officer to us every morning, one that will treat us like ladies and lay out the pleasure of the day.

An exhaustive list of further imitations is hardly necessary. Bickerstaffe's only original addition consists in the transformation of Roxelane from a French into an English slave, but this change of nationality has not the slightest influence upon the heroine's manners and actions: she remains the free and happy Parisian girl of Favart, who "with that little cocked up nose" changes the century-old customs of the Turkish Empire and marries the most inconstant of Sultans. This adaptation shows that Favart's success was not exclusively limited to his country and that his *Vaudevilles*—even in the inferior adaptation of Bickerstaffe—were popular in England.

RENÉ GUIET.

University of Illinois.

* Marmontel in this particular instance says *tea* and not *sherbet*. Bickerstaffe follows here Favart's change.

SCOGAN'S *Quem Quaeritis* AND TILL EULENSPIEGEL

In *MLN.* xxxvii, 289 ff., Professor Willard Farnham has reprinted and discussed Scogan's tale of the Easter play, the eighth jest in the 1613 edition of *Scoggins Iestes*, stating that "with some assurance we can guess that this tale of the priest and his one-eyed lemman describes an English play." He considers the claim of this 1613 edition to be 'translated out of French' a fiction, and states "that Scogan's jest makes very probable the existence in England, say during the early fifteenth century, of such a version as is described, but even if the setting is French, this slovenly told little story is full of interest."

However this jest of Scogan, as other readers of the *MLN.* have doubtless recognized, is taken from Till Eulenspiegel. Friedrich W. D. Brie has pointed out in his *Eulenspiegel in England (Palaestra, Vol. xxvii, 1903)* that eight of the jests of the 1913 edition of Scogan, and in fact eight consecutive ones, numbers seven to fourteen inclusive, including this the eighth, are from Till Eulenspiegel. An examination of these, such as Brie has made, shows that their source is William Copland's *Howlglass*, the English translation of Till Eulenspiegel made about 1560. The only important alteration in the story in Scogan is the introduction of a pronounced anti-Catholic sentiment, not found in its source.

So far as I know, this jest has not been found in any earlier source than the earliest preserved edition of Till Eulenspiegel, the German edition published at Strassburg in 1515. It is found, with Eulenspiegel as hero, in a German Meistersang, belonging apparently to about the middle of the sixteenth century (reprinted in Lappenberg's *Ulenpiegel*, p. 233). In view of the fact that many of the abundant medieval jests about priests and monks doubtless originated and circulated in clerical circles, one is tempted to conjecture that this one had a clerical origin and was possibly first told in Latin. It is clearly not of English origin, and there is no evidence of French origin.

The interest of this *Quem quaeritis* jest to students of the early drama was pointed out by Lappenberg as early as 1854 in his *Ulenpiegel*. In the English literature concerning the religious drama, the jest was first related, so far as I know, by Karl Pearson in 1897 in his study of the German Passion Play, published in his *Chances of Death*, Vol. II, p. 246 f. The woodcut of this story, with its temporary sepulchre and its fighting participants, I have recently reproduced, from the edition of 1515, in a study of *The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy, with special reference to the Liturgic Drama* (p. 64^b). (Reviewed in *MLN.* June, 1922.)

NEIL C. BROOKS.

University of Illinois.

ENGL. *bless* = LAT. *benedicere*

Für engl. *bless* hat wohl kein Etymologe diese Gleichung gewagt; ich wage es, eine solche aufzustellen und zu begründen. Die Herleitung aus dem germ. Wurzelverb *blōtan*, 'opfern' ist für den christlichen Wortinhalt von *bless* höchst unwahrscheinlich. Auch Zusammenhang mit germ. *blōd*, 'Blut,' ist ganz unsicher. Dem spätnordhumbr. *blædsan* ist kein Gewicht beizulegen, da für *æ* bloss Lautsubstitution bei dem Übergang des Wortes aus einer Sprache oder Mundart in eine andere vorliegen kann. Das Verb erscheint im Frühangls. des *Vesp. Psalters* als *bledsian*, *gebledsian*, mit der Ableitung *bledsung*, und zwar sehr häufig (z. B. III, 9 *bledsung*, v, 13 *bledsas* in meinem *Angls. Lesebuch*⁴, S. 19, 21): wäre echtes *ǣ* (*ô* + *i*-Umlaut) für das Urengl. anzunehmen, so würde der *Vesp. Psalter* regelmässig *oe* schreiben, und das kommt niemals vor. Vgl. Bülbring *Aengl. Elementarbuch* § 339. Ich vermute Übergang von lat. *benedicere* in *b(e)ledicere*, und verweise auf den Tausch von *l* mit *n* in nhd. *schleunig*, mhd. *sluene*, aus ahd. *sniumo*. So zeigt auch lat. *meretricem* im Romanischen die Nebenformen *meletricem* und *menetricem*. Der Übergang von *l* zu *n* spielt bekanntlich in der Geschichte der deutschen Worte *Himme*, *Kümmel* und *sammeln* eine grosse Rolle. Das Problem solcher Übergänge hat Horn zum Gegenstand eifriger Nachforschungen gemacht.

Bei dem nahen Anklang von angl. *bledsian* an den Gegensatz *cúrsian* darf man vielleicht an die Möglichkeit gegenseitiger Beeinflussung in Bezug auf das *s*-Suffix denken. Zwar kennt man das letzte Etymon von angl. *cúrsian* nicht, aber dass es zunächst aus altir. *cúrsagaim*, 'ich fluche,' stammt, weiss man schon lange: ich habe seit der 2. Aufl. meines *Angls. Leseb.* 1897, diesen Zusammenhang auch in der *English Etymology*, S. 53 und in *Pauls Grundriss*, I, 929 vertreten. Da fällt es nun auf, dass lat. *benedico* in altir. *bendachaim* steckt, wodurch zugleich Zusammenhang mit angl. *blesian* nahegelegt wird.

Begrifflich empfiehlt sich dieser Zusammenhang von drei christlichen Worten ganz von selbst, und wir gewinnen aus lat. *benedicere* einerseits und angl. *bledsian* andererseits eine Mittelform *bled(i)sôn* mit Vertretung der mlat. *z*-Aussprache in *dicere* durch *s*. Dafür braucht Anlehnung an *cúrsian* nicht direkt beteiligt zu sein, aber die Möglichkeit wird man doch zugeben müssen. Dass das mittlere *i* der Grdf. *bledisôn* keinen *i*-Umlaut von *e* zu *i* veranlasst hat, bleibt zwar eine Schwierigkeit, braucht aber bei einem verhältnismässig späten christlichen Lehnbegriff doch nicht abzuschrecken. Ich empfehle die Nachprüfung meiner Deutung allen Kennern.

F. KLUGE.

Freiburg, Baden.

"Under the Sonne he loketh"

Professor C. Alphonso Smith has offered (*MLN.* xxxvii, pp. 120-121) an interesting explanation of Chaucer's phrase "Under the sonne he loketh." He holds that it means: "all around the horizon," and, in support he quotes two passages from American versions of ballads, in which the words "looked all under the sun" have clearly the meaning of: "Looked from East to West, from North to South." Professor Klaeber has pointed out that similar constructions occur in Old English (*MLN.* xxxvii, p. 376). Professor Tatlock differentiates between Chaucer's "under the sonne," and the "all under the sun" of the ballads. He believes that Chaucer's words must be taken literally: Theseus looked in the direction of the early morning-sun.

It seems of interest, in this connection, to call attention to an example of the phrase in an early Flemish ballad: *Mi Adel en Hir Alewijn*¹ a poem of 246 verses, deeply influenced by the *Gudrun*.² Professor G. Kalff dates it from the 13th or 14th century.

Vs. 112-16:

Als ik aan de fonteine kwam,
'k Keek in den Oosten en in den Westen,
Maar onder de zonne was 't allerbeste.
Wat zag ik onder de zonne blinken?
't Was een pelgrim die mij wenkte.

When I arrived at the fountain,
I looked to the East and to the West,
But under the sun was by far the best.
What did I see shining under the sun?
It was a pilgrim who hailed me.

The appearance of the phrase "looked . . . under the sun" in old Flemish, confirms Professor Klaeber's remark that it is based on old Germanic idiom. On the other hand, in the Flemish song, it does not seem to be a synonyme for "looked to the East and to the West"; it is contrasted with this expression:

I looked to the East and to the West,
But under the sun. . . .

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

University of Minnesota.

¹ Published first by Lootens and Feys in *Chants populaires flamands avec les airs notés . . . recueillis à Bruges*, 1879, p. 66.

² For a discussion of this influence, see G. Kalff, *Het Lied in de Middelen-eeuwen*, 1884, pp. 93, 105.

"Under the Sonne"

In view of the present interest in the phrase "under the sun," it may be worth while to call attention to another Anglo-Saxon example:

Arās þā tōgēnes,	Gode þancade,
þæs ðe hīe onsunde	ǣfre mōston
gesēon under sunnan,	<i>Andreas</i> , 1011-3.

Professor Klaeber has mentioned briefly the parallel in "under swegle" (*M. L. N.* xxxvii, pp. 376-7); but I think one might fail to realize from his casual reference how close the similarity in this case really is. Just before the passage that I have quoted above occurs the following:

	Hē þær āna sæt
geohðum gēomor	in þām gnornhofe;
geseh þā under swegle	swæsne gefēran,
hālig hāligne; hyht wæs geniwad,	1007-10.

This phrase was frequently used: *Andreas*, l. 98; *Beowulf*, 1078, 1197; *Genesis*, 1414 (a doubtful case); *Crist*, 502; *Elene*, 75; *Phoenix*, 186, 199, 467. As usual, Professor Klaeber's note covers practically the whole ground; but it seems to me interesting to point out that, as the passages in the *Andreas* show, the phrases were almost interchangeable, and in connection with this fact to remember that "swegl" sometimes means specifically the "sun" (for example, at least as early as *Guthlac B*, 1304; cf. *Exodus*, 105). Cf. also: *under swegles begong*, *under swegles gang*, *under swegles hlēo*.

HOWARD R. PATCH.

Smith College.

BRIEF MENTION

The Story of Glaucus in Keats's Endymion, by H. Clement Notcutt, Professor of English in the University of Stellenbosch, South Africa (Printed for the Author by the South African Electric Printing Co., Capetown, 1921. 20 pp.). In the 'brief mention' of *An Interpretation of Keats's Endymion*, *MLN.* xxxv, 316-320, the assumed allegorical significance of the story of Glaucus was singled out as one of the prominent features of Professor Notcutt's suggestive essay. It was assumed that "the figure of Glaucus and the story of his adventures, which fill nearly the whole of the third book of the poem," are employed by the poet with definite reference to the meaning and purpose of the poem as an organic whole. Professor Notcutt now reports that his interpretation of this feature, as first published, has been accepted by some critics, that others have not been convinced by it, but prefer to continue to believe that the poet "had no definite mean-

ing in his mind in writing this story; which amounts to saying that Keats, in the middle of what he was trying to make a great poem, allowed himself to wander from the point, and to indulge for pages at a time in writing irrelevant nonsense that had no bearing upon anything in particular." Even so discerning a critic as Professor Oliver Elton, in *Mod. Lang. Review* xv, 417, patronizingly envies Professor Notcutt's "liberty of dreaming within the dream of Keats," tho he cannot follow him far, and prefers to continue in the belief that the poet must be assumed to have been content "to draw fantastic pictures for their own sake and without a hidden meaning." He indicates his view of the proposed interpretation of the story of Glaucus with merely a summary of it couched in that form of surprise that does not admit of serious consideration: "the history of Glaucus in book III is an emblem of the struggles of romantic poetry during the eighteenth century. Circe, who for a time misled Glaucus, means Pope; her victims (Notcutt, p. 59; *Endymion*, III, 513 ff.) are the victims in the *Dunciad*; and the treasures that Glaucus seizes from the old man are Percy's *Reliques*, nothing less."

Professor Notcutt has persisted in his conviction that the poet must have had a definite and recognizable purpose in his rendering of the story of Glaucus. He now offers a fresh presentation of the argument previously put forward, the ground of his contention being that "Keats was a thinker as well as a singer, and to suppose that he would have allowed himself to fill up a poem of this kind with mere idle dreaming, having no point or sense, seems neither fair to the poet nor critically sound."

The argument rests on the assumption "that Circe is intended to represent Pope," and Professor Notcutt has now an answer to the question, How did the poet come to select this mode of figuring his disapproval of neo-classicism? From the *Bathos* "it may be seen," he declares, "that the identification did not originate with Keats, but with no less an authority than Pope himself!" He turns to that portion of the *Bathos* (Elwin and Courthope, x, 361 f.) in which Pope has symbolized his victims, designating them by the initial letters of their names, under the names and characteristics "of animals of some sort or other." This chapter, Warton observed, gave special offence, which Pope tried in vain to palliate by declaring that the initial letters "were placed at random, and meant no particular writers." This convinced no one. He had, Professor Notcutt says, "transformed his victims after the manner of Circe," and in the next chapter makes clear that this legend was in his mind; in other words, the inference is plain that he had consciously played the rôle of Circe, for the legend is in his mind when he ridicules a couplet from Broom. In that couplet Phœbus takes his way thru the monsters of the Zodiac, and Pope is ready with the comment: "The author's pencil, like the wand of Circe,

turns all into monsters at a stroke." Upon that evidence, Professor Notcutt concludes that "It seems sufficiently evident that we have here the origin of the Circe episode in *Endymion*" (p. 12).

If it be agreed, for the sake of argument, that it has thus been shown what suggested to Keats his employment of the legend, the next step, legitimated by literary practice, is to grant the poet freedom and independence in the adaptation of the legend to the purpose of his poem. He could not be required to be as faithful to the transmitted details of the legend as to the meaning the legend is employed to typify. And surely the legend as found in Ovid (Keats's principal source) does not obviously bear the stamp of an effective symbol of what Keats is assumed to have had in mind. The symbol must have been suggested to the poet thru some special observation or other; and this establishes a strong presumption in favor of Professor Notcutt's inference from Pope's *Bathos*.

How can it be believed that the legend of Glaucus, as it dominates so large a portion of the poem, does not definitely admit of an interpretation that makes clear some prominent aspect of the purpose of the poem? That belief, which is still favored by otherwise discerning minds,—well, for inherent improbability, where is it matched in literary criticism? Moreover, is not the key-note of the true interpretation sounded in the introductory lines of the third book, in which influences are described as having "not one tinge of sanctuary splendor"? There is thus a two-fold basic assumption in support of Professor Notcutt's argument.

The *Interpretation* (1919) is supplemented by the pamphlet now under consideration chiefly by "four leading points where Keats has introduced original elements into it" [the classical story of Glaucus], examined "with a view to seeing what light they may throw on the purpose underlying this part of the poem." Before taking up these points it is noticed that the poet "has made no use of the quaint and picturesque account of the way in which Glaucus came to win the freedom of the sea." This omission must indicate that the poet had "some meaning to express with which the incident could not be related." The view is thus confirmed that the legend is in other respects handled freely to symbolize a definite meaning, coherent in all its parts.

The first "leading point" is the observation, with fresh emphasis, that while, in the earlier part of the story, Glaucus is like Endymion in his striving after an ideal, his subsequent deflection from the true path devised by the poet cannot have been invented at random; it must be purposeful. This "divergence of their stories suggests that while the later poetic movement (represented by Endymion) remained faithful to the ideal that inspired it, the earlier (for which Glaucus stands) had been seduced from the loftiness of purpose that had at first inspired it, and had followed

lower and less worthy aims." This deflection is, in Keats's judgment, true of the pseudo-classic school. It follows that the punishment inflicted upon Glaucus, again "invented by Keats in wilful disregard of the statement of Ovid that Circe could do no such thing, was the punishment that fell upon English poetry as the direct result of yielding to these enticements: it lost all poetic force, and fell into decrepitude." The story of Glaucus thus revised, says the author, "forms a very effective pictorial representation of the view that was held and proclaimed by Keats and others who were associated with him in the new poetical movement."

Secondly the poet has modified the story with respect to the vengeance wreaked upon Scylla by Circe. Standing for "a poetical ideal" of which for a time the influence is suspended, Scylla is put into "a deathlike trance in which her beauty is not marred, and from which she is eventually restored to life." Obviously this modification of the story is ingeniously devised "to suit the meaning that was to be conveyed."

The third 'point' is pivotal. If it is to be assumed, as reported above, that Keats obtained from Pope himself the suggestion that led to the exhibition of Pope in the guise of Circe, it becomes reasonable to hold that the poet having first seized upon this central feature proceeded from it to conform the legend of Glaucus as a whole to his purpose. When one considers that legend as a whole, putting together the details from Ovid and Homer, certain outstanding features of it do not at a glance suggest a possible adaptation to the poem; on the contrary those features seem to make such a figured use next to impossible. The poet's procedure in this case might therefore be supposed to represent an aspect of the tenet *durior lectio*; but that aspect must be restricted to characterize the poet's ingenuity in employing the legend after it was suggested to him by a look into Pope's *Bathos* and *Dunciad*. The conduct of Pope towards his victims was as unusual in character as the 'fantastic' conduct of Circe towards her victims, and Pope himself, as has been noticed, indirectly suggested the analogy. At this 'point' it is accordingly argued in some detail that Circe of the poem represents Pope. The argument is ingenious but not fancifully forced; it is rather so clear and direct that one is strongly inclined to pronounce it conclusive. It deserves unbiassed consideration.

If the preceding steps in the argument be approved, the closing incidents in the poet's adaptation of the legend will not appear incredible in the light of the evidence already disclosed of his resourceful power of invention in sustaining the dominant figure of this portion of the poem. To complete the figure Glaucus must be restored to youthful vigor, and Scylla must be awakened from sleep and restored to the effective influence of her beauty. These

incidents of course imply the decline of the power of Circe. For this sequel Keats had to depart altogether from his classical authorities and rely upon "pure invention." The interpretation runs thus: English poetry (Glaucus) had become impotent under the influence of Pope (Circe) but a new life now began to pulse thru its veins, and so the poet invents the account of the restoration of Glaucus. Sitting one day on a rock, Glaucus saw a vessel coming "from the horizon's brink" (which "stands for the ballad literature that had come down from the earlier centuries, and in which men were beginning to take a new interest"). The vessel as it came nearer was wrecked in a tempest, and Glaucus still feeble because of the curse of Circe, was unable to save "any of those who cried for help. As he was lamenting his inability to rescue them there emerged from the waters at his feet an old man's hand, grasping a scroll and a wand. He laid hold of these, and even caught the old man's finger, but it slipped through his enfeebled grasp, and the last survivor of the wreck perished. The scroll however was saved. Glaucus read it with rapt attention, and found in it a promise of redemption."

As to the scroll, Professor Notcutt's interpretation shall again be submitted to the judgment of the readers of this periodical. The vessel signifying the old ballad literature, "the wrecking of the ship and the 'gulphing' of all on board, represent the disappearance of the great mass of the ballads, and the complete oblivion that has overtaken their authors." The scroll that was saved signifies "the famous manuscript out of which [Percy's] *Reliques* grew. Just as Percy was barely in time to save it from destruction, so the scroll was with difficulty, and only at the last moment, rescued from the waves; and as the unknown transcriber of the manuscript sank into oblivion, so the hand that held out the scroll to Glaucus slipped through his grasp, and the unknown benefactor sank out of sight."

The deliverance of Glaucus is effected by Endymion, "the spirit of the new poetry," who greeted Glaucus in the cry (III, 713), "We are twin brothers in this destiny!" Endymion, scattering in the face of Glaucus some pieces of the scroll, restored him to youthful vigour; and then, 'showering these powerful fragments' on Scylla and on the files of seemingly dead bodies [representing the older poets], brought them back to life. Thus was accomplished the revival of poetry."

This second study strengthens the first, but there is necessarily considerable repetition that would have been avoided, with great advantage, if what is now added had been taken up in a revised edition of the *Interpretation*. This revision is also desirable because it would enable Professor Notcutt to discuss those details which have been withheld in sketching the main features of his argument.

J. W. B.

If You are Living in the Twentieth Century

Surely twentieth century writers have a place in your Spanish class. When your students have finished a beginner's book, give them

Trozos Modernos

*Edited by Carolina Marcial Dorado and
Medora Loomis Ray*

And you give them selections from the foremost poets, novelists, and dramatists who are busy interpreting contemporary Spain. You give them a practical vocabulary, direct-method exercises, and, incidentally, some pleasure.

Ginn and Company

*Boston New York Chicago London
Atlanta Dallas Columbus San Francisco*

Essays and Studies

\$1.40

PROSE SELECTIONS FOR COLLEGE READING.

Chosen and Arranged by FREDERICK M. SMITH, Assistant Professor of English, Cornell University.

Though published the latter part of May, the following colleges, among others, are using *Essays and Studies* in their fall work: University of Southern California—University of Minnesota—Williams College—Smith College—Syracuse University—Wellesley College—Miami University—College of Wooster.

Short Stories of America

\$1.44

AN INTERPRETATION OF NATIONAL LIFE AND SPIRIT.

Edited by ROBERT L. RAMSAY, Ph. D., Professor of English, University of Missouri.

"The scheme of the book is novel, and it is justified by its execution. That is to say, the sixteen tales in this volume are all worth reading; they are nearly all true short stories, and they have one and all the indigenous perfume which the editor was seeking to capture."—BRANDER MATTHEWS.

BOSTON
NEW YORK

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

CHICAGO
SAN FRANCISCO

DCH

DCH

Jack's Manual of French Pronunciation and Diction

An *elementary and practical* handbook that avoids all theoretical discussion and comprises suitable exercises in each one of its forty brief chapters. Part I treats of the Vowels, Part II of the Consonants, and Part III of Words in Combination.

JACK'S MANUAL contains the following *special features*:

- (a) Consistent correlation, as far as practicable, with English and American speech sounds.
- (b) A series of unique diagrams showing the pronunciation of the French sounds.
- (c) Special chapters on such rarely treated topics as the tonic accent in the word and emphatic stress in the sentence.
- (d) Careful consideration of intonation and rhythm in speech.

JACK'S MANUAL is a book of immediate interest to pupils making an intensive study of French; to students specializing in French phonology; and to those who intend to become teachers of French. It is also eminently suited for inclusion in school libraries and for the teacher's personal reference shelf.

We invite your correspondence

D. C. HEATH & COMPANY

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

DCH

DCH

JUST PUBLISHED

NITZE AND DARGAN'S HISTORY OF FRENCH LITERATURE

781 pp. 8vo.

It will mark an important date in French studies in America.

—EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG, *Princeton University*.

This is an extremely valuable and welcome book, which will do a great deal to help in the instruction in French literature in this country, and should also be widely used by private readers.

In particular, it is gratifying to have a history of French literature written by two men one of whom is a specialist in Old French and in the sixteenth century, while the other is a specialist in modern literature. A fault in many histories of French literature, even including the standard one by Lanson, is that the author did not possess a first-hand, intimate knowledge of the mediæval period. Professor Nitze, of course, writes about this period with the authority of a specialist, as Professor Dargan does about the nineteenth century.

—KENNETH MCKENZIE, *University of Illinois*.

The authors have succeeded admirably in emphasizing and giving sufficient attention to not only the main currents but also the movements of French literature.

It is in my opinion the best work which has appeared in English on the history of French literature.

—OLIVER M. JOHNSTON, *Stanford University*.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

New York

Boston

Chicago

San Francisco